

[illegible]

[illegible]

##0###:#####

#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####Magistri Petri Lombardi#Arch. Episc. Parisiensis#Master  
Peter Lombard#Archbishop of Paris##Sententiarum Quatuor Libri#The Four Books of  
Sentences##LIBER PRIMUS SENTENTIARUM.0DE DEI UNITATE ET TRINITATE#THE FIRST BOOK  
OF THE SENTENCES0ON THE UNITY AND TRINITY OF GOD##DISTINCTIO XI.#DISTINCTION  
11##Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,#Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 207-208.#Cum  
Notitiis Editorum Quaracchi#Latin text taken from Opera Omnia S.  
Bonaventurae,#Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 207-208.#Notes by the Quaracchi  
Editors.##0 Cap. I.0Quod Spiritus sanctus procedit a Patre et Filio, quem tamen  
Graeci a Filio procedere diffitentur.#0 Chapter I0That the Holy Spirit proceeds  
from the Father and the Son, whom, however, the Greeks disavow to proceed from  
the Son.##Hic dicendum est, Spiritum sanctum esse a Patre et Filio et procedere  
a Patre et Filio, quod multi haeretici negaverunt. 0Quod autem de utroque  
procedat, 0 multis divinatorum eloquiorum testimoniis comprobatur 0.10 Dicit enim  
Apostolus:0 Misit Deus Spiritum Filii sui in corda nostra. 0Ecce hic dicitur  
Spiritus Filii.0 Et alibi:20 Qui autem Spiritum Christi non habet, hic non est  
eius.0 Ipse etiam Filius de Spiritu sancto dicit in Evangelio:30 Quem ego mittam  
vobis a Patre.0 Patris autem Spiritus dictus est, ubi legitur:40 Si Spiritus  
eius, qui suscitavit Iesum a mortuis, habitat in vobis. 0Et ipse Christus  
dicit:50 Non enim vos estis, qui loquimini, sed Spiritus Patris vestri, qui  
loquitur. 0Et in alio loco:60 Quem mittet Pater in nomine meo. 0Et alibi ipse  
Filius de Spiritu sancto ait:0 De Patre procedit. 0His et aliis pluribus  
auctoritatibus ostenditur, quod Spiritus sanctus a Patre et Filio procedit.#Here  
it must be said, that the Holy Spirit is from [a] the Father and the Son and  
proceeds from the Father and the Son, which (dogma) many heretics deny.0  
Moreover that He proceeds from [de] Both, 0 by the many testimonies of divine  
utterance is completely proven 0.10 For the Apostle says:0 God sent the Spirit  
of His Son into our hearts. 0Behold here the Spirit is said (to be) of the Son.  
0And elsewhere:20 But he who does not have the Spirit of Christ, this one does  
not belong to Him. 0The Son Himself also says of the Holy Spirit in the  
Gospel:30 Whom I shall send to you from [a] the Father.0 Moreover, the Spirit is  
said (to be) of the Father, where there is read:40 If the Spirit of Him, who  
raised Jesus from the dead, dwells in you.0 And Christ Himself says:50 For you  
are not the ones, who speak, but the Spirit of your Father, who speaks.0 And in  
another place:60 Whom the Father will send in My Name. 0And elsewhere the Son  
Himself says of the Holy Spirit:0 He proceeds from [de] the Father. 0By these  
and very many other authorities is shown, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from [a]  
the Father and the Son.##Graeci tamen dicunt, Spiritum sanctum procedere tantum  
a Patre, et non a Filio. 0Quod ideo dicunt, quia Veritas in Evangelio fidem  
integre continente, de processione Spiritus loquens, solum Patrem commemorat  
dicens:0 Spiritus, qui a Patre procedit;7 et etiam ideo, quia in principalibus  
Conciliis, quae apud eos celebrata sunt,8 ita Symbola eorum subiunctis  
anathematibus sancita sunt, ut nulli de Trinitatis fide aliud docere vel aliter  
praedicare, quam ibi continetur, liceat. 0In quibus quidem Symbolis cum Spiritus  
sanctus commemoratur procedere a Patre, et non a Filio, quicumque, inquit, a  
Filio cum procedere addunt, anathema incurrunt; unde et nos arguunt anathematis  
reos. 0Addunt etiam ad assertionem suae opinionis et in testimonium nostrae  
damnationis de Symbolo fidei, quod secundum traditionem praedictorum Conciliorum  
Leo tertius Romae transcriptum in tabula argentea post altare beati Pauli posita  
posteris reliquit, pro amore, ut ipse ait; et cautela fidei orthodoxae. 0In quo  
quidem Symbolo in processione Spiritus solus commemoratur Pater his verbis:0 00  
Et in Spiritum sanctum, Dominum et vivificantem, ex Patre procedentem, cum  
Patre et Filio coadorandum et glorificandum 09 etc.0 Illud est Symbolum, quod in  
Missa cantatur, editum . . .#The Greeks, however, say, that the Holy Spirit  
proceeds only from the Father, and not from the Son. 0Wherefore, for that reason  
they say, that the Truth in the Gospel wholly containing the Faith, saying of  
the procession of the Holy Spirit, mentions [commemorates] only the Father,

saying: The Spirit, who proceeds from the Father;7 and also for this reason, that in the principle Councils, which were celebrated among them,8 their Symbols (i.e. Creeds) were so sanctioned with subjoined anathemas, that it is licit for no one to teach something else concerning the Faith in the Trinity [nulli de Trinitatis fide aliud] and/or to preach in another manner, than is contained there. Indeed in which Symbols, when the Holy Spirit is mentioned to proceed from the Father, and not from the Son, anyone whomsoever, they say, adds that He proceeds from the Son, incurs anathema; whence they also accuse us (to be) guilty of anathema. They also add to the assertion of their own opinion and in testimony of our own damnation concerning the Symbol of Faith, that following [secundum] the tradition of the aforesaid Councils, (Pope) Leo III of Rome, left for posterity [posteris] transcribed on tablets of silver in front of the altar of blessed (St.) Paul, for love, as he said; and as a defense [cautela] of the orthodox faith. Indeed, in which Symbol, only the Father is mentioned in the procession of the Spirit, with these words: And in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and Vivifier, proceeding out of the [ex] Father, with the Father and the Son to be co-adored and glorified 9 etc.. That is the Symbol, which is sung at Mass, put forth . . . ##10 August. de Trin. XV. c. 26. n. 45. Plerique textus s. Scripturae, qui sequuntur, apud eundem exhibentur, sed alio ordine et multis interpositis verbis. Primus textus Apostoli est Gal. 4, 6, ubi Vulgata cum Augustino et edd. 1, 2, 5, 7, 8 habet corda vestra pro corda nostra.20 Rom. 8, 9. Codd. et ed. 1 citant ibi pro alibi, sed perperam.30 Ioan. 15, 26.40 Rom. 8, 11, ubi edd. contra mss. A C E legunt Christum pro Iesum.50 Matth. 10, 20. Codd. B D addunt cum Vulgata in vobis.60 Ioan. 14, 26 et sequens locus ibid. 15, 26, ubi Vulgata: a Patre procedit. Codd. omittunt in ante alio loco.70 Ioan. 15, 26. Paulo ante pro integre Vat. cum nonnullis edd. integram, sed refragantibus codd. et melioribus edd. Etiam Abaelardus (Theol. christ. lib. IV. col. 1300. seq.) legit integre, ex quo Magister fere ad verbum excerpserit quae sequuntur usque ad: Illud est Symbolum.80 Haec Concilia sunt Nicaenum (a. 325), Constantinopolitanum I (a. 381), Ephesinum (a. 430) et Chalcedonense (a. 451).90 In his verbis Symboli ed. 1 legit: vivificantem pro vivificatorem; et ed. 5 conglorificandum pro glorificandum. Textus vulgo receptus est: Dominum et vivificantem (in graeco, #####  
#####  
#####  
##t0o0 0p0n0e0u0m0a0 0t0o0 #a0g0i0o0n0,0 #t0o0 0x0u0r0i0o0n0,0 #t0o0 0z0w0o0p0o0i0o0n0)# #q#u#i# #e#x# #P#a#t#r#e# #p#r#o#c#e#d#i#t# #(#e0x0p0o0r0e0u0o0m0e0n0o0n0)#,# #q#u#i# #c#u#m# #P#a#t#r#e# #e#t# #F#i#l#i#o# #s#i#m#u#l# #a#d#o#r#a#t#u#r# #e#t# #c#o#n#g#l#o#r#i#f#i#c#a#t#u#r# #0#.# #0#M#a#g#i#s#t#e#r# #e#r#r#o#n#e#e# #v#o#c#a#t# #h#o#c# #S#y#m#b#o#l#u#m# #N#i#c#a#e#n#u#m#,# #c#u#m# #s#i#t# #C#o#n#c#i#l#i#i# #C#o#n#s#t#a#n#t#i#n#o#p#o#l#i#t#a#n#i# #I#.###0#####1#0# #(#S#t#.#)# #A#u#g#u#s#t#i#n#e#,# #0#n# the Trinity, Bk. XV, ch. 26, n. 45. The many texts of Sacred Scripture, which follow, are found in the same place; but in another order and with many words interposed. The first text of the Apostle is Gal. 4:6, where the Vulgate together with (St.) Augustine and editions 1, 2, 5, 7, and 8 has your hearts [corda vestra] for our hearts [corda nostra].20 Rom. 8:9. The codices and edition 1 cite there [ibi] instead of elsewhere [alibi], but faultily.30 Jn. 15:26.40 Rom. 8:11, where the editions, contrary to manuscripts A C and E, read Christ [Christum] for Jesus [Iesum].50 Mt. 10:20. Codices B and D add with the Vulgate in you [in vobis].60 Jn. 14, 26 and the following passage ibid. 15:26, where the Vulgate has: proceeds from the Father [a Patre procedit]. The codices omit in [in] before another place [alio loco].70 Jn. 15:26. A little before this in place of wholly containing the faith [fidem integre continente] the Vatican edition together with not a few codices has containing the whole Faith [fidem integram continente], but in disagreement with the codices and the better editions. Even (Peter) Abelard (Theol. Christ., Bk. IV, col. 1300 ff.) reads wholly [integre], from which (book) Master (Peter Lombard) excerpts nearly word for word the things which follow, up to: That is the Symbol [Illud est Symbolum].80 These Councils are Nicea (A.D. 325), Constantinople I (A.D. 381), Ephesus (A.D. 430) and Chalcedon

(A.D. 451).<sup>90</sup> In these words of the Symbol edition 1 reads: Vivifying One  
[vi#v#i#f#i#c#a#n#t#e#m#]# #f#o#r# #V#i#v#i#f#i#e#r#  
#[#v#i#v#i#f#i#c#a#t#o#r#e#m#]#;# #a#n#d# #e#d#i#t#i#o#n# #5# #h#a#s#  
#c#o#n#g#l#o#r#i#f#i#e#d# #[#c#o#n#g#l#o#r#i#f#i#c#a#n#d#u#m#]# #f#o#r#  
#g#l#o#r#i#f#i#e#d# #[#g#l#o#r#i#f#i#c#a#n#d#u#m#]#.# #0## 0# #T#h#e#  
#t#e#x#t# #p#o#p#u#l#a#r#l#y# #r#e#c#e#i#v#e#d# #i#s#:#0# 0# #t#h#e# #L#o#r#d#  
#a#n#d# #V#i#v#i#f#i#e#r# #(#i#n# #t#h#e# #G#r#e#e#k#,# #t#o# 0p#n#e#u#m#0a#  
0t#o# #a#g#i#o#n#0,# #t#o# 0x#u#r#i#o#n#0,# #t#o# 0z#w#o#p#o#i#o#n#0)# #w#h#o#  
#p#r#o#c#e#e#d#s# #f#r#o#m# #t#h#e# #F#a#t#h#e#r#  
#(#e#x#p#o#r#e#u#o#m#e#n#o#n#0)#,# #w#h#o# #t#o#g#e#t#h#e#r# #w#i#t#h# #t#h#e#  
#F#a#t#h#e#r# #a#n#d# #t#h#e# #S#o#n# #i#s# #a#d#o#r#e#d# #a#n#d#  
#c#o#n#g#l#o#r#i#f#i#e#d# #0#.# #0##M#a#s#t#e#r# #(#P#e#t#e#r#)#  
#e#r#r#o#n#e#o#u#s#l#y# #c#a#l#l#s# #t#h#i#s# #t#h#e# #N#i#c#e#n#e#  
#C#r#e#e#d#,# #e#v#e#n# #t#h#o#u#g#h# #i#t# #b#e#l#o#n#g#s# #t#o# #t#h#e#  
#F#i#r#s#t# #C#o#u#n#c#i#l# #o#f# #C#o#n#s#t#a#n#t#i#n#o#p#l#e#.#0#####0#  
#p#.# #2#0#8##0##i#n# #N#i#c#a#e#n#o# #C#o#n#c#ilio, in fine cuius subiunctum  
est: Qui aliud docuerit vel aliter praedicaverit, anathema sit. Ideoque  
Graeci nos anathematizatos dicunt, quia dicimus, Spiritum sanctum a Filio  
procedere, quod ibi non continetur. Quod enim secundum nos ibi dicitur: Qui  
a Patre Filioque procedit, alterum a Latinis additum, scilicet Filioque. In  
the Nicene Council, at the end of which there has been subjoined: He who has  
taught something else [aliud] and/or preached in another manner, anathema sit.  
And for that reason the Greeks say we (are) anathematized, because we say, that  
the Holy Spirit proceeds from [a] the Son, which is not contained there. For  
because according to us there is said there: Quia Patre Filioque procedit  
the second of the two (words has) been added by the Latins, namely  
Filioque. Nos autem illa verba ita determinamus: qui aliud docuerit, vel  
aliter praedicaverit, id est contrarium docuerit vel contrario modo  
praedicaverit, anathema sit. Aliud ergo posuit pro opposito, qualiter et  
Apostolus in Epistola ad Galatas: Si quis aliud evangelizaverit, id est  
contrarium, anathema sit. Non dicit: si quid addiderit. Nam si illud  
diceret, sibi ipsi, ut ait Augustinus,<sup>2</sup> praeiudicaret, qui cupiebat venire ad  
quosdam, quibus scribebat, sicut ad Thessalonicenses, ut suppleret, quae illorum  
fidei deerant. Sed qui supplet, quod minus erat addit, non quod inerat tollit.  
Qui autem praetergreditur fidei regulam, non accedit in via, sed recedit a via.  
Ad illud autem, quod de Evangelio opponunt, respondemus ita: quia cum dicat  
in eo Veritas, Spiritum sanctum a Patre procedere, non addit solo, et ideo etiam  
a se procedere non negat; sed ideo Patrem tantum nominat, quia ad eum solet  
referre etiam quod ipsius est, quia ab illo habet. But we determine those words  
thus: who has taught something else, and/or preached in another manner,  
that is has taught the contrary and/or preached in a contrary manner, anathema  
sit. Therefore it puts something else [aliud] in place of opposite, just as  
the Apostle (Paul) does in (his) Letter to the Galatians: If anyone has  
preached another Gospel [aliud evangelizaverit], that is a contrary one,  
anathema sit. He does not say: if one has added anything [quid]. For if he  
would say that, he would, as (St.) Augustine says,<sup>2</sup> have prejudged his very  
self, he who desired to come to certain ones, to whom he wrote, just as to the  
Thessalonians, to supply, those (things) which were lacking to their faith. But  
he who supplies, adds what was less, he does not take away what was therein.  
Moreover, he who steps aside from the rule of Faith, does not enter upon the  
way, but retreats from the way. Moreover, to that, which they oppose from the  
Gospel, we respond thus: that when the Truth says in it, that the Holy Spirit  
proceeds from the Father, He does not add only, and for that reason He does not  
deny that He proceeds from Himself; but names the Father only for this reason,  
that He is accustomed to refer to Him even that which is His own, because He has  
it from Him. Cap. II. De convenientia Latinorum et Graecorum in sensu, et  
differentia in verbis. Chapter II On the agreement of the Latins and the Greeks  
in sense, and (their) difference in words. Sciendum est tamen, quod Graeci  
confitentur, Spiritum sanctum esse Filii, sicut et Patris, quia et Apostolus  
dicit<sup>3</sup> Spiritum Filii, et Veritas in Evangelio Spiritum veritatis. Sed cum non  
sit aliud Spiritum sanctum esse Patris vel Filii, quam esse a Patre et Filio,  
etiam in hoc in eandem nobiscum fidei sententiam convenire videntur, licet in

verbis dissentiant. #It must be known, that the Greeks confess, that the Holy Spirit is of the Son, just as also of the Father, because the Apostle says<sup>3</sup> the Spirit of the Son, and the Truth in the Gospel the Spirit of truth. ¶ But since ¶ that there is Holy Spirit of the Father and/or of the Son ¶ is not other, than ¶ that He is from the Father and the Son ¶, they also seem in this to agree [conveniunt] in the same sentence of faith with us, though they dissent in words. ## Unde etiam quidam eorum catholici doctores, intelligentes, unam eandemque fore sententiam praedictorum verborum, quibus dicitur Spiritus sanctus procedere a Filio et esse Filii, professi sunt, Spiritum sanctum etiam a Filio procedere. ¶ Unde Athanasius in Symbolo fidei: 4 ¶ Spiritus sanctus a Patre et Filio, non factus nec creatus nec genitus, sed procedens ¶. ¶ Ecce Spiritum sanctum aperte dixit procedere a Patre et Filio. ¶ Didymus etiam, eorum maximus Doctor, in libro de Spiritu sancto<sup>5</sup> Spiritum sanctum a Filio procedere dicit: ¶ Salvator, inquit, qui et Veritas, dicit: ¶ Non enim loquetur a semetipso, hoc est, non sine me et sine meo et Patris arbitrio, quia inseparabilis et a me et a Patris voluntate, quia ex se non est, sed ex Patre et me est. ¶ Hoc enim ipsum, quod subsistit et loquitur, a Patre et a me illi est ¶. ¶ Item: 6 ¶ Spiritus sanctus, qui est Spiritus veritatis Spiritusque sapientiae, non potest audire a Filio loquente quae nescit, cum hoc ipsum sit, quod profertur a Filio, id est, procedens Deus de Deo, Spiritus Veritatis procedens a Veritate, consolator manans ex consolatore ¶. ¶ Item Cyrillus episcopus in Epistola Nestorio directam ait: 7 ¶ Spiritus intelligitur per se, secundum quod Spiritus est, et non Filius; sed tamen non est alienus ab eo. ¶ Spiritus enim Veritatis nominatur et profluit ab eo, sicut ex Deo Patre ¶. ¶ Ioannes quoque Chrysostomus in homilia quadam de Expositione Symboli<sup>8</sup> sic ait: ¶ Iste est Spiritus sanctus procedens de Patre et Filio, qui dividit dona propria, prout vult ¶. ¶ Idem in alia homilia: ¶ Credendum est, Spiritum sanctum Patris esse et Filii. ¶ Istum Spiritum sanctum dicimus Patri et Filio coaequalem et procedentem de Patre et Filio. ¶ Hoc credite, ne colloquia mala corrumpant bonos mores ¶. 9 ¶ Ecce a doctoribus Graecorum aperta habemus testimonia, quibus Spiritus sanctus a Patre et Filio procedere ostenditur. ¶ Omnis ergo lingua confiteatur Spiritum sanctum procedere a Patre et Filio. # Whence also certain catholic Doctors, understanding, there to be one and the same sentence of the aforesaid words, by which the Holy Spirit is said to proceed from the Son and to be of the Son, have professed, that the Holy Spirit also proceeds from the Son. ¶ Whence (St.) Athanasius in (his) Symbol of Faith (says): 4 ¶ The Holy Spirit (is) from the Father and the Son, not made nor created nor begotten, but proceeding ¶. ¶ Behold he said openly that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. ¶ Even (St.) Didymus (the Blind), their greatest Doctor, in the book On the Holy Spirit<sup>5</sup> says that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son: ¶ The Savior, he says, who (is) also the Truth, says: ¶ He does not speak by Himself, that is, not without Me and without My judgment [arbitrio] and (that) of the Father, because (He is) inseparable from Me and from the Father's Will, because He is not out of [ex] Himself, but is out of the Father and Me. ¶ For this very (Being), which subsists and speaks, is His from the Father and from Me ¶. ¶ Likewise: 6 ¶ The Holy Spirit, who is the Spirit of truth and the Spirit of wisdom, cannot hear, from [a] the Son speaking, (things) which He does not know, since He is the very (Being), which is proffered by the Son, that is, God proceeding from [de] God, the Spirit of the Truth proceeding from [a] the Truth, the Consoler overflowing [manans] out of the [ex] Consoler ¶. ¶ Likewise (St.) Cyril, the Bishop, in the Letter addressed to Nestorius, says: 7 ¶ The Spirit is understood through Himself, according to which He is the Spirit, and not the Son; but yet He is not alien from [a] Him. ¶ For He is named the Spirit of the Truth and flows forth from Him, just as (He flows) out of [ex] God the Father ¶. ¶ Also (St.) John Chrysostom in a certain homily On the Exposition of the Creed<sup>8</sup> speaks in this manner: ¶ This is the Holy Spirit proceeding from [de] the Father and the Son, who divides His own gifts, as He wills ¶. ¶ (He says) the same in another homily: ¶ It must be believed, that the Holy Spirit is of the Father and of the Son. ¶ We say that this Holy Spirit of theirs (is) coequal to the Father and Son and proceeding from the Father and the Son. ¶ Believe this, lest evil conversations corrupt good customs ¶. 9 ¶ Behold from the Doctors of the Greeks we openly have the testimonies, by which the Holy Spirit is shown to proceed from [a] the Father

and the Son. ¶Therefore let every tongue confess that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son.###10 Gal. 1, 8 et 9.0 00 Sed Vulgata cum Augustino in loco mox sequenti non legit aliud, sed v. 8 praeter quam quod et v. 9. praeter id quod;0 Augustinus praeter quod.20 Tract. 98. in Ev. Ioan. n. 7.0 00 Respicitur in textu Augustini ad I. Thess. 3, 10. 000 In fine textus Vat. et aliae edd., excepta 1, legunt incedit pro accedit, refragantibus omnibus codd. et textu. Augustini; in nostra lectione subaudi: ad terminum.30 Gal. 4, 6, et mox Ioan. 16, 13.0 00 Paulo supra ante Patris, codd. et edd. 1, 2, 3, 7, 8 omittunt et; in fine sequentis propositionis codd. B C D E omittunt in ante verbis.40 Symbolum:0 Quicumque, sub nomine Athanasii notissimum. 000 Hic Vat. sola praetermittit nec genitus post creatus.50 Num. 34. Patrolog. Graec. tom. 39. col. 1063.0 00 Vat. cum plerisque edd. contra mss. et original ante Veritas legit est pro et. 0Adiunximus dicit post Veritas, auctoritate cod. B et originalis, ac postulante contextu. 000 Textus Scripturae est Ioan. 16, 13.0 00 Immediate post Vat. et edd. 4, 9 inseparabiliter pro inseparabilis, quod etiam habet Didymus; tum proseguitur:0 Inseparabilis a mea pro me.60 Loc. cit. n. 36.0 00 In fine huius textus omnes mss. et edd. praeter Vat. legunt consolatione pro consolatore.0 Cum autem versio Hieronymi habeat consolatore et textus gracus perierit, nihil mutavimus.70 Epist. 17. 000 Immediate ante sola Vat. Nam Cyrillus pro Item Cyrillus.80 Hae homiliae in ed. Maurinorum Chrysostomi non inveniuntur. 0Eodem moto citantur et eadem verba utriusque textus referuntur ab Abaelardo, Theol. Christ. lib. V. (Ed. Migne) col. 1322. et 1323.0 00 Impressae autem sunt istae homiliae in ed. latina omnium operum S. Ioan. Chrysostomi, Antwerpiae apud Ioan. Keebergium 1614. tom V. p. 287:0 In Symbolum Apostolorum expositio. Homil. I. incipit:0 Universalis gaudet . . . p. 288. col. 1. sic legitur:0 00 Credo in Spiritum sanctum. 0Iste Spiritus ubique totus est, ubi vult spirat.0 Ipse est qui dixit:0 Separate mihi Paulum et Barnabam in opus, ad quod assumsi eos. 0Iste est Spiritus procedens de Patre et Filio, qui dividit propria dona singulis prout vult. 0Ergo iste Spiritus consecrat, santificat etc. 00 Ibid. Homil. II. incipit: Super fabricam totius etc.; ubi circa med. legitur:0 0 Natus de Spiritu sancto. 0Istum Spiritum sanctum dicimus Patri et Filio esse coaequalem et procedentem de Patre et Filio. 0Hoc credite, ne colloquia mala corrumpant mores vestros bonos.0 Sunt enim haeretici 0 etc.0 00 Locus sequens Scripturae est I. Cor. 12, 11; Vulgata:0 dividens singulis prout vult.90 Respicitur ad I. Cor. 15, 33, et mox in verbis omnis lingua etc. ad Philip. 2, 11.0##10 Gal. 1:8-9.0 00 But the Vulgate, together with (St.) Augustine, in the passage soon to follow does not read something else [aliud], but in v. 8 has besides the one which [praeter quam quod], and in v. 9 has besides that which [praeter id quod];0 (St.) Augustine reads besides that which [praeter quod].20 Tract 98, On the Gospel of John, n. 7. 000 At the end of the text the Vatican and the other editions, except n. 1, read walks upon [incedit] for enters upon [accedit], in disagreement with all the editions and the text of (St.) Augustine; in our reading understand:0 to the end.30 Gal. 4:6, and then Jn. 16:13.0 00 A little above this before of the Father [Patris], the codices and editions 1, 2, 3, 7, and 8, omit and [et]; at the end of the following proposition codices B C D E read with words [verbis] for in words [in verbis].40 The Creed Quicumque, widely known under the name 0the Athanasian Creed0.0 00 0Here the Vatican edition alone leaves out nor begotten [nec genitus] after created [creatus].50 Patrologia Graeca, Vol. 34, tom. 39, col. 1063. 000 The Vatican edition with very many editions, against the manuscripts and the original, before the Truth [Veritas] reads is [est] for (is) also [et]. 0We have added says [dicit] after the Truth [Veritas], on the authority of codex B and the original, and as required by the context.0 00 The text of Scripture is Jn. 16:13.0 00 Immediately after the Vatican edition and editions 4 and 9 have inseparably [inseparabiliter] for inseparable [inseparabilis], which (St.) Didymus also has; then it proceeds:0 Inseparable from Mine [mea] for Me [me]. 60 Loc. cit., n. 36.0 00 At the end of this text all the manuscripts and the editions, except the Vatican, read consolation [consolatione] for the Consoler [consolatore].0 But since the version of (St.) Jerome has the Consoler [consolatore] and the Greek text has been lost, we have changed nothing.70 Epistle 17.0 00 Immediately before this the Vatican edition alone has For (St.) Cyril [Nam Cyrillus] for Likewise (St.) Cyril [Item

Cyrillus].<sup>80</sup> These homilies are not found in Maurinus' edition of Chrysostom. In the same manner the same words are cited in each text referred to by (Peter) Abelard, Theol. Chirst., Bk. V, (Migne's edition), col. 1322 and 1323.<sup>81</sup> Moreover these homilies have been published in the Latin edition of the works of St. John Chrysostom, Antwerp, John Keeberg, 1614, tom. V, p. 287.<sup>82</sup> An Exposition of the Apostle's Creed, Homily I, with the incipit: Universalis gaudet . . . , p. 288, col. 1, where there is read: I believe in the Holy Spirit. That Spirit is everywhere whole, He breathes where He will. He Himself is the One who said: Separate for Me Paul and Barnabas for the work, for which I have undertook tem. He Himself is the Spirit proceeding from [de] the Father and the Son, who divides His own gifts to each one, as He wills. Therefore this Spirit of theirs consecrates, sanctifies etc. Ibid., Homily II, with the incipit: Super fabricam totius etc.; where in about the middle there is read: Born of the Holy Spirit. That Holy Spirit we say is the Coequal of the Father and the Son, and the One proceeding from the Father and the Son. Believe this, lest evil conversations corrupt your good customs. For there are heretics etc. The following passage of Scripture is 1 Cor. 12:11; the Vulgate has dividing to each as He wills [dividens singulis prout vult].<sup>90</sup> A reference to 1 Cor. 15:33, and then at the words every tongue etc. to Philip. 2:11.<sup>91</sup> The English translation here has been released to the public domain by its author. The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quaracchi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation than that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [ ] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator. Items in round ( ) brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis#S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae#atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis#St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio#Cardinal Bishop of Alba& Doctor of the Church##Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum#Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences##Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis#of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris##PRIMI LIBRI#BOOK ONE##COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XI.#COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XI##De aeterna processione Spiritus sancti quantum ad principium, a quo procedit.#On the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit as much as regards the Principle, from whom He proceeds.##ARTICULUS SOLE. Quaestio I.#ARTICLE I#Question 1##Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,#Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 209-214.#Cum Notitiis Originalibus##Latin text taken from Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,#Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 209-214.#Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.##Hic dicendum est, Spiritum sanctum esse a Patre et Filio.#Here it must be said, that the Holy Spirit is from the Father and the Son.##DIVISIO TEXTUS.#DIVISION OF THE TEXT##Supra egit Magister de processione Spiritus sanctus in comparatione ad ipsum procedentem; haec est secunda pars, in qua agit de eadem in comparatione ad principium a quo. Et dividitur haec pars in duas. In prima ostendit, quod Spiritus sanctus procedit a Patre et Filio. In secunda determinat, qualiter procedat ab eis, infra distinctione duodecima. Item quaeritur, cum Spiritus sanctus procedat a Patre et Filio.#Above Master (Peter) deals with the procession of the Holy Spirit in comparison to the One proceeding; this is the second part, in which he deals with the same in comparison to the principle from which (He proceeds). And this part is divided into two (parts). In the first he shows, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from [a] the Father and the Son. In the second he determines, in what manner He proceeds from Them, below in the twelfth distinction, (where he says): Likewise there is asked, since the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son etc.##Prima iterum pars habet quatuor. In prima ostendit Magister per multas auctoritates, quod procedit a Patre et Filio. In secunda vero e contra per rationes Graecorum ostendit, quod a solo Patre, ibi: Graeci tamen dicunt, Spiritum sanctum tantum procedere a Patre. In tertia auctoritates et rationes Graecorum solvit et determinat, ibi: Nos autem illa verba ita determinamus. In quarta ostendit, confessionem fidei Graecorum implicite continere nostram,<sup>3</sup> ibi: Sciendum tamen, quod Graeci confitentur.#Again the first part has four (parts). In the first Master (Peter) shows through many authorities, that He



proceeds from the Father and the Son. ¶ However, in the second contrariwise [e contra] through the reasons of the Greeks he shows, that (they say He proceeds) from the Father alone, there (where he says): ¶ However, the Greeks say, that the Holy Spirit proceeds only from the Father. ¶ In the third he solves the authorities and reasons of the Greeks and determines (them), there (where he says): ¶ But we determine those words thus. ¶ In the fourth he shows, that the Greeks confession of faith implicitly contains ours,<sup>3</sup> there (where he says): ¶ It must be known, that the Greeks confess. ##TRACTATIO QUAESTIONUM. #TREATMENT OF THE QUESTIONS ##Ad intelligentiam huius partis duo principaliter quaeruntur. #For an understanding of this part two (things) are principally asked. ##Primo quaeritur de processione Spiritus sancti quantum ad principium, et quaeritur, utrum Spiritus sanctus procedat a Patre et Filio. Secundo, utrum procedat a Patre et Filio, in quantum sunt unum, aut

in quantum sunt differentes. #First there is asked concerning the procession of the Spirit as much as regards (His) principle, and there is asked, whether the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. Second, whether He proceeds from the Father and the son, inasmuch as They are One (Being), or inasmuch as They are different. ##ARTICULUS UNICUS. ¶ De principio processionis Spiritus sancti. #ARTICLE SOLE ¶ On the principle of the procession of the Holy Spirit. ##QUAESTIO I. ¶ Utrum Spiritus sanctus a Patre et a Filio procedat. #QUESTION 1 ¶ Whether the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. ##QUOD AUTEM solum a Patre procedat, probant Graeci ratione et auctoritate. #BUT THAT He proceeds only from the Father, the Greeks prove by reason and authority. ##1. Ratione sic: ¶ emanatio Spiritus sancti est processio; sed processio est motus ab uno in alium: ¶ ergo si recte est processio in divinis, Spiritus sanctus aeterna processione procedit ab uno in alium. ¶ Si ergo procedit a Filio, aut procedit in Patrem, aut in aliam personam; non in Patrem, quia Pater nihil accipit a Filio, nec in aliam personam, cum non sit dare quartam: ¶ ergo non procedit a Filio. #1. ¶ By reason in this manner: ¶ the emanation of the Holy Spirit is a procession; but a procession is a movement from one into another: ¶ if rightly there is a procession among the divine, the Holy Spirit proceeds by an eternal procession from one into another. ¶ If, therefore, He proceeds from the Son, either He proceeds into the Father, or into another Person; but not into the Father, because the Father accepts nothing from the Son, nor into another Person, since one is not to posit a fourth: ¶ therefore He does not proceed from the Son. ##2. Item, alia ratione sic: ¶ quia Spiritus sanctus procedit per modum spirationis, sicut Verbum per modum locutionis: ¶ sed ita videmus in creaturis, quod exitus locutionis non praecedit spirationem, nec egressus spiritus est a verbo: ¶ ergo nec in divinis Spiritus sanctus<sup>4</sup> a Filio. #2. ¶ Likewise, by another reason, in this manner: ¶ because the Holy Spirit proceeds through the manner of breathing [spiratione], just as the Word through a manner of speaking: but thus we shall see among creatures, that the going-forth [exitus] of speech [locutionis] does not precede the breath [spirationem], nor is the stepping forth [egressus] of the breath from the word: ¶ therefore among the divine neither (is)<sup>4</sup> the Holy Spirit from the Son. ##3. Item, Spiritus sanctus, ut omnes dicunt, procedit per modum nexus, sed nexus tenet rationem medii: ¶ sed si procederet a Patre et<sup>5</sup> Filio, teneret rationem tertii et extremi, non medii: ¶ ergo non procedit a Patre et Filio, sed potius a Patre in Filium. #3. Likewise, the Holy Spirit, as all say, proceeds through a manner of a connection [nexus], but a ¶ nexus ¶ holds a reckoning of a ¶ means ¶: ¶ but if He were to proceed from the Father and<sup>5</sup> the Son, He would have the reckoning of a ¶ third ¶ and an ¶ extreme ¶, not of a ¶ means ¶: ¶ therefore He does not proceed from the Father and the Son, but rather from the Father into the Son. ##4. Item, Spiritus sanctus procedit a Patre aut sufficienter, aut non. ¶ Si non sufficienter et plene, ergo Pater imperfectus est<sup>6</sup> in spirando; si sufficienter, . . . #4. ¶ Likewise, the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father either sufficiently, or not. ¶ If not sufficiently and fully, therefore the Father is<sup>6</sup> imperfect in spirating; if sufficiently, . . . ##1 ¶ Sequimur plures codd. ut F H T W etc. cum ed. 1 ponendo agit loco agitur. 2 ¶ Vat. praeter fidem mss. et ed. 1 omittit iterum. 3 ¶ Vat. absque auctoritate mss. et ed. 1 convenire cum nostra. 4 ¶ In cod. W additur est. 5 ¶ Restituimus ex antiquis mss. et ed. 1 verba a Vat. minus bene omissa Patre et, ac paulo infra potius. 6 ¶ In Vat. et cod. cc omittitur est, quod tamen habetur in aliis mss. et ed. 1. ##1 ¶

We follow the very many codices, such as F H T W etc., together with edition 1, by putting he deals [agit] in place of is dealt [agitur].<sup>2</sup> The Vatican edition, not trusting in the manuscripts and edition 1, omits again [iterum].<sup>3</sup> The Vatican, without the authority of the manuscripts and edition 1, [Trans. note: by taking the object of the subordinate clause at its subject] has convenes with ours [convenire cum nostra].<sup>4</sup> In codex W there is added is [est].<sup>5</sup> We have restored from the ancient manuscripts and edition 1 the words, less well omitted by the Vatican edition, the Father and [Patre et], and a little below this the rather [potius].<sup>6</sup> In the Vatican edition and codex cc the is [est] is omitted, which is however had in the other manuscripts and in edition 1.###p. 210ergo superfluum est fieri per duo quod potest fieri per unum sufficienter:10 ergo si a Filio procedit, cum procedat plene a Patre, in illa summa Trinitate est superfluitas, quod absurdum est. #therefore it is superfluous that there comes to be through Two what can come to be sufficiently through One:10 therefore if He proceeds from the Son, since He proceeds fully from the Father, in that most high Trinity there is a superfluity, which is absurd.##5. Item, hoc ipsum nituntur Graeci ostendere per auctoritatem; sed non possunt per sacrae Scripturae introductionem,<sup>2</sup> ideo arguunt per privationem in Evangeliiis, et maxime in Evangelio Ioannis et Epistolis, ubi integre traditur nostra fides, sed in nullo dicitur, quod Spiritus sanctus procedat nisi a Patre tantum; Ioannis decimo quinto:30 Spiritum veritatis, qui a Patre procedit:0 ergo aut Evangelia insufficienter fidem docent, aut Spiritus sanctus tantum procedit a Patre. #5. Likewise, the Greeks strive to show this very (thing) through authority; but they cannot by bringing in Sacred Scripture [per sacrae Scripturae introductionem],<sup>2</sup> for this reason they argue through what is lacking [privationem] in the Gospels, and mostly in the Gospel of (St.) John and (his) Epistles, where our faith is wholly handed down, but there is in no (place) said, that the Holy Spirit proceeds except only from the Father;0 John (chapter) fifteen:30 The Spirit of Truth, who proceeds from the Father:0 therefore either the Gospels insufficiently teach the Faith, or the Holy Spirit proceeds only from the Father.##6. Item, in quatuor Conciliis apud Graecos celebratis, ubi a Patribus fides sufficienter est explicata, dicitur, quod Spiritus sanctus procedat a Patre, et nihil dicitur de Filio:0 ergo si Deus sufficienter illis fidem revelavit:0 ergo etc. #6. Likewise, in the four Councils celebrated among the Greeks, where the Faith was sufficiently explained by the Fathers, it is said, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from [a] the Father and nothing is said of the Son:0 therefore if God sufficiently revealed the Faith to them: ergo etc. ##7. Item, hunc errorem munire<sup>4</sup> nituntur per Doctores, qui non solum apud eos, sed etiam apud nos celebres sunt. #7.0 Likewise, they strive to fortify<sup>4</sup> this error through the Doctors, who are not only celebrated among them, but also among us. ##Et primo per Gregorium Nazianzenum,<sup>5</sup> qui dicitur Theologus:0 0 Filius et Spiritus sanctus, geminus Patris radius, usque ad nos miserunt claritatem suam 0: ergo exeunt a Patre, ut duo radii. #And first through (St.) Gregory Nazianzen,<sup>5</sup> who is called 0the Theologian0:0 0 The Son and the Holy Spirit, twin ray of the Father, have sent unto us Their own brightness 0:0 ergo They have gone forth from the Father, as two rays. ##8. Et Dionysius etiam dicit in libro de Divinis Nominibus:60 0 Ex immateriali et impartibili bono cordialia exorta sunt lumina 0, 0 0loquitur de Patre 00 ergo exeunt ut lumina; sed talia sic se habent, quod unum non est ab altero:0 ergo etc. #8. And (St.) Dionysius (the Areopagite) also says in (his) book On the Divine Names:60 0 Out of the immaterial and impartible Good there have risen forth cordial lights 0, 0 he speaks of the Father 0 0therefore lights have risen forth; but such so hold themselves, that one is not from the other one:0 ergo etc. ##9.0 Item, Damascenus<sup>7</sup> expressius:0 0 Spiritum sanctum ex Patre dicimus et Spiritum Patris nominamus;0 Spiritum vero sanctum ex Filio non dicimus, et tamen Spiritum Filii nominamus 0. #9. Likewise, (St. John) Damascene more expressly (says):0 0 We say that the Holy Spirit (is) out of [ex] the Father and we name Him the Spirit of the Father; however we do not say that the Holy Spirit (is) out of the Son, and yet we do name Him the Spirit of the Son 0. ##10.0 Item, si Latini hoc cognoverunt, cum<sup>8</sup> Graci non cognoverunt, aut fuit hoc Scripturae auctoritate, aut praedicatione, aut ratione, aut revelatione. 0Scripturae auctoritate non; quia eandem per omnia Scripturam habent Graeci; similiter nec praedicatione,

quia idem doctor Graecorum, qui est et Latinorum, qui eis fidem perfecte tradidit, scilicet Paulus Apostolus; si ratione, sed ratione non sufficit aliquid affirmare in his quae sunt fidei. ¶ Unde Dionysius<sup>9</sup> et Damascenus dicunt, quod nihil est dicendum nec cogitandum de illa summa Trinitate praeter id quod nos sacra eloquia docuerunt, et Hieronymus:<sup>10</sup> ¶ Nil credatur mihi, nisi confirmavero per novum et vetus Testamentum. ¶ Si revelatione, quaeritur, cui fuerit revelatum et cum Deus velit omnes homines salvos fieri, quare hoc non revelavit<sup>11</sup> Graecis? ¶ Et iterum quomodo constat quod hoc fuerit a Deo?#<sup>10</sup>. Likewise, if the Latins knew this, when<sup>8</sup> the Greeks did not know it, either it was by the authority of Scripture, or by preaching, or by reason, or by revelation. ¶ Not by the authority of Scripture; because the Greeks have the same Scripture in everything [per omnia]; similarly not by preaching, because the same (is) the Doctor of the Greeks, who is of the Latins, who perfectly handed down the Faith, namely (St.) Paul the Apostle; if by reason, but it does not suffice to affirm by reason in those (things) which belong to the Faith. ¶ Whence (Sts.) Dionysius and (John) Damascene say, that nothing is to be said nor thought concerning that

most high Trinity except that which the Sacred Utterances have taught us, and (St.) Jerome (says):<sup>10</sup> ¶ Nothing is believed by me, except what I have confirmed through the New and Old Testament. ¶ If by revelation, it is asked, to whom was it revealed and since God wants all men to be saved, why did He not reveal this<sup>11</sup> to the Greeks? ¶ And again in what manner is it established that this was from God?##<sup>CONTRARIUM</sup><sup>12</sup> 1. arguitur ratione ostensiva sic: ¶ Spiritus sanctus secundum omnes fideles procedit ut donum, sicut ex multis locis Scripturae probatur; et iterum, omnes tam Graeci quam Latini dicunt, Spiritum sanctum a Filio nobis donari: ¶ ergo omnes concedunt, procedere ab utroque, cum non detur, nisi a quo procedit.#<sup>THE CONTRARY</sup><sup>12</sup> 1. is argued by a demonstrative reckoning in this manner: ¶ The Holy Spirit according to all the faithful proceeds as a gift, just as is proven from many passages [locis] of Scripture; and again, all, both Greeks and Latins, say, that the Holy Spirit is given to us by the Son: ¶ therefore all concede, that He proceeds from Both, since nothing is given, except by that from which it proceeds.##<sup>2</sup>. Item, Spiritus sanctus secundum omnes, et sicut supra ostensum est,<sup>13</sup> procedit ut amor; sed amare non tantum est Patris, sed etiam Filii, unde et per omnia amat Filius, sicut et Pater: ¶ ergo si a Patre amante amor procedit, eadem ratione a Filio.#<sup>2</sup>. Likewise, the Holy Spirit according to all, as just as has been shown above,<sup>13</sup> proceeds as love, but ¶ to love ¶ belongs not only to the Father, but also to the Son, whence the Son even loves through all, just as even the Father (does): ¶ therefore if Love proceeds from a loving Father, for the same reason from the Son.##<sup>3</sup>. Item, Spiritus sanctus secundum omnes procedit ut nexus;<sup>14</sup> sed perfectior nexus est, qui ab extremo utroque procedit, quam qui ab altero: ¶ ergo si Spiritus sanctus est nexus perfectissimus, non solum a Patre procedit, sed etiam a Filio.#<sup>3</sup>. Likewise, the Holy Spirit according to all proceeds as a nexus;<sup>14</sup> but a more perfect connection [nexus] ¶ is that, which proceeds from each extreme, than that which (does) from one of the two [ab altero]: ¶ therefore if the Holy Spirit is the most perfect Nexus, He proceeds not only from the Father, but also from the Son.##<sup>4</sup>. Item, hoc idem ostenditur ratione ducente ad impossibile sic: ¶ omnis distinctio personarum in divinis attenditur secundum relationem et originem: ¶ ergo si Spiritus sanctus non procedit a Filio, nec e converso, nulla est ibi origo: ¶ ergo nulla est ibi mutua relatio, ergo nec distinctio.#<sup>4</sup>. Likewise, the same (argument) is shown by a reckoning leading to the impossible in this manner: ¶ every distinction of Persons among the divine is tended towards according to relation and origin: ¶ therefore if the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Son, nor the other way around [nec e converso], there is no origin there: ¶ therefore there is no mutual relation there, therefore neither a distinction.##<sup>5</sup>. Item, maior germanitas est inter duos, quando unus procedit ab altero, et ambo a tertio, quam si unus nihil habeat ab altero; haec est per se nota: ¶ ergo si Spiritus sanctus non est a Filio, nec e converso, non<sup>15</sup> est perfecta unio: ¶ ergo nec summa nec perfecta beatitudo.#<sup>5</sup>. Likewise, there is greater kinship [germanitas] among two, when one proceeds from the other, and both from a third, than if one has nothing from the other; this is self-evident [per se nota]: ¶ therefore if the Holy Spirit is not from the Son,

nor the other way around, there is not<sup>15</sup> a perfect union: therefore neither a most high nor a perfect beatitude.##6. Item, perfectior est expressio, quando gene- / -rans communicat genito . . .#6. Likewise, more perfect is the expression, when the one begetting / communicates to the one begotten . . .###  
10 Aristot. verba vide supra d. 10. a. 1. q. 1. ad. 4. 20 Postulantibus mss. et sex primis edd., substituimus introductionem loco inductionem. Mox verba per privationem in Evangeliiis idem valent ac haec: ex silentio Evangelium.30 Vers. 26.40 Vat. contra vetustiores codd. et ed. 1 tutari loco munire.50 Oratio 45. ad Evagrium Monach. de Divinitate (ed. Venet. 1753): Salvator quoque noster et Spiritus sanctus geminus ille Patris radius, simul et ad nos usque veritatis lucem ministrant et Patri uniti sunt.60 S. Doctor respicere videtur haec Dionysii (c. 2) verba, quae et a S. Thom. (hic a. 1.) et a Richard. (hic q. 1.) allegantur: Rursum a Scripturis sacris accepimus, Patrem quidem esse originem in divinis, Iesum vero et Spiritum sanctum, quasi Dei prolem, vel, si dictu fas sit, quasi germina divina, floresve ac lumina supersubstantialia existere. Sed textus noster in versionibus Scoti et Corderii verbotenus non legitur.70 Libr. I. de Fide orthodox. c. 8.80 Fide multorum mss. ut A E G H I K M O T V Z posuimus cum loco tamen.90 De Div. Nom. c. 1. circa princ. Damasc. I. de Fide orthodox. c. 2.100 Haec verba a Scholasticis communiter attribuuntur S. Hieronymo, in quo tantum sententia similis in Epist. 41. ad Marcellam legitur. Sunt autem S. Cyrilli Hierosol. Cath. IV. de Decem Dogmat. n. 17. (Patrolog. Graec. tom. 33. col. 478) dicentis: Ne mihi quidem ista proferenti ultro credas, nisi de divinis Scripturis eorum quae tibi annuntio demonstrationem acceperis.110 Cod. Y est revelatum. Paulo infra cod. W loco hoc habet haec, scil. revelatio.120 Aliqui codd. ut T V X In contrarium.130 Dist. 10. a. 1. q. 2. Paulo post cod. W amor loco amare.140 Dist. 10. a. 2. q. 2. 150 Vat. cum cod. cc minus distincte et contra alios codd. et ed. 1 nec pro non. Paulo ante ed. 1 hoc est per se notum pro haec est per se nota.##10 See the words of Aristotle above in d. 10, a. 1, q. 1, reply to n. 4.20 As required by the manuscripts and the six first editions, we have substituted bringing [introductionem] in place of inducing [inductionem]. Then the words through what is lacking in the Gospels [privationem in Evangeliiis] are equivalent to: from the silence of the Gospels.30 Verse 26.40 The Vatican edition, contrary to the older codices and edition 1, has protect [tutari] in place of fortify [munire].50 Oration 45, To King Evagrius on Divinity (Venice: 1753): Also, Our Savior and the Holy Spirit, that twin ray of the Father, together and to us continually [usque] minister the light of truth and are united to the Father.60 It seems that the Seraphic Doctor refers to these words of (St.) Dionysius, which are alleged both by St. Thomas (here in a. 1) and Richard of St. Victor (here in q. 1): Again, we have received from the Sacred Scriptures, that the Father indeed is the Origin among the Divine (Persons), but that Jesus and the Holy Spirit exist, as the offspring of God, and/or, if it is permitted to speak thus, as the divine Germs, or Flowers and supersubstantial Lights. But our text in the versions of Scotus and Corderius texts does not read that far [verbotenus].70 On the Orthodox Faith, Bk. I, ch. 8.80 Trusting in many manuscripts, such as A E G H I K M O T V Z, we have put when [cum] in place of yet [tamen].90 On the Divine Names, ch. 1, near the beginning. (St. John) Damascene, On the Orthodox Faith, Bk. I, ch. 2.100 These words are commonly attributed by the Scholastics to St. Jerome, in which only a similar sentence is read in his Epistle 41 to Marcellus. But there are those of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, Cath. de Decem Dogmat., n. 17 (Patrologia Graeca, tom. 33, col. 478), who says: Indeed believe me not, when I proffer these things on my own accord, but accept the demonstration, which I am telling you, of them from the divine Scriptures.110 Codex Y was this not revealed [hoc non est revelatum]. A little below this codex W in place of this [hoc] has this [haec], that is, revelation.120 Some codices, such as T V and X, have In the Contrary it [In contrarium].130 Distinction 10, a. 1. q. 2. A little after this codex W has love [amore] in place of to love [amare].140 Distinction 10, a. 2, q. 2. 150 The Vatican edition, together with codex cc, has less distinction and contrary to the other codices and edition 1, neither [nec] for not [non]. A little before this edition 1 has this is self-evident in the neuter [in the sense of this argument rather than this reckoning].###p. 211quando gene- / -rans

communicat genito non tantum substantiam, sed etiam actum, qui naturae genititi non repugnat; sed actus spirandi non repugnat Filio, quia nullum ex hoc inconueniens sequitur, si spiret: ergo si Pater hunc actum ei non communicat, Filius non est perfecta imago. #communicates to the one begotten not only (his) substance, but also (his) acting, which is not repugnant to the nature of the one begotten; but the act of spirating is not repugnant to the Son, because nothing inconvenient follows from this, if He spirates: therefore if the Father does not communicate this act to Him, the Son is not the perfect Image of the Father. ##7. Item, hoc ipsum ostenditur auctoritatibus, et primo auctoritate Apostoli ad Galatas quarto:20 Misi Deus Spiritum Filii sui etc.; ergo cum Pater non mittat Spiritum nisi Filii, idem est Spiritus Patris et Filii; sed eius est Spiritus, a quo procedit; ergo Spiritus sanctus procedit a Patre et Filio. Si dicas, quod non sequitur, quia non dicitur Filii, quia procedit a Filio, sed quia est in Filio: ergo eadem ratione, cum Filius sit in Spiritu sancto, potest dici Filius Spiritus sancti.3#7. Likewise, this very (thing) is shown by authorities, and first by authority of the Apostle (Paul in his Letter) to the Galatians, (chapter) four:20 God sent the Spirit of His Son etc.: therefore since the Father does not send the Spirit, except of the Son, the Same is the Spirit of the Father and of the Son; but the Spirit belongs to Him, from whom He proceeds; therefore the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son.

If you say, that it does not follow, because of the Son is not said, because He proceeds from the Son, but because He is in the Son: therefore by the same reckoning, since the Son is in the Holy Spirit, the Son can be said (to be) the Son of the Holy Spirit.3##8. Item, Ioannis decimo quinto:40 Quem ego mittam vobis a Patre Spiritum veritatis. Ex hoc arguitur sic: nullus mittit alium, nisi habeat auctoritatem super illum; nullus autem habet auctoritatem super alium, nisi aliquid tribuat ei; sed nulla persona tribuit alii, nisi ab ipsa procedat: ergo a primo, Spiritus sanctus procedit a Filio. Si dicas, quod a Filio mittitur ex tempore et ex tempore procedit; contra: Filius non ideo habet auctoritatem, quia mittit, sed ideo mittit, quia habet auctoritatem: ergo ante habet auctoritatem, quam mittat temporaliter: ergo antequam mittat temporaliter, necesse est Spiritum sanctum procedere a Filio: ergo etc.#8.

Likewise, (the Gospel of St.) John, (chapter) fifteen:40 Whom I will send you from the Father, the Spirit of Truth. From this (verse) it is thus argued: no one sends another, unless he has authority over him: but no one has authority over another, unless he bestows something upon him: but no Person bestows upon an Other,5 except that He proceeds from Him: therefore from the first, the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son. If you say, that He is sent from the Son in [ex] time and in time proceeds (from Him): on the contrary: The Son does not, for this reason, have authority, because He sends, but for this reason He sends, because He has authority: therefore He has authority before he sends temporally: therefore before He sends temporally, it is necessary that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son: ergo etc..##9. Item, Ioannis decimo sexto:60 Ille me clarificabit, quia de meo accipiet. Ex hoc arguitur sic: quisquis est omne quod habet, est omne quod accipit: sed Spiritus sanctus, cum sit Deus summe simplex, est omne quod habet, ergo omne quod accipit: ergo si accipit aliquid ab aliquo, accipit esse;7 sed a quo accipit esse, ab illo procedit: ergo si aliquid accipit a Filio, procedit a Filio. Si dicas, quod accipere illud est temporaliter; tunc obiicitur ex hoc, quia omne quod temporaliter accipit aliquid ab aliquo,8 mutatur, etc.#9. Likewise, (the Gospel of St.) John, (chapter) six:60 He will glorify Me, because He shall received from mine own. From this (verse) it is thus argued: anyone is everything [omne] which he has, is everything which he accepts; but the Holy Spirit, since He is God most highly simple, is everything which He has, therefore everything which He accepts: therefore if He accepts anything from anyone, He accepts (His own) Being [esse];7 but from whom He accepts Being, from Him He proceeds: therefore if He accepts anything from the Son, He proceeds from the Son. If you say, that that accepting is (meant) temporally; then it is objected from this, that everything which accepts anything temporally from anyone,8 is changed, etc..##CONCLUSIO. Spiritus sanctus procedit a Patre et a Filio. #CONCLUSION The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. ##RESPONDEO: Dicendum, quod, sicut ostensum est auctoritatibus et rationibus, fidei veritas est, quod

Spiritus sanctus procedit a Patre et Filio. #I RESPOND: It must be said, that, as has been shown from authorities and by reasons, it is a truth of the Faith, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. ##Ad intelligentiam autem controversiae Latinorum et Graecorum et originem eius notandum est, quod circa processionem Spiritus sancti de Filio est duo considerare, scilicet articuli cognitionem et eiusdem cogniti professionem. In primo ortu est differentia, in secundo controversia. #But to understand the controversy of the Latins and Greeks, there must also be noted its origin, wherefore about the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son there are two (things) to consider, namely, the cognition of the article (of the Faith) and the profession of the same cognized. In the first has arisen a difference, in the second a controversy. ##Cognitio autem huius articuli fundamentum habet a Scriptura, profectum vel incrementum a ratione, sed consummationem a revelatione. In Scripturae auctoritate Graeci et Latini conveniunt, quae dicit, Spiritum sanctum esse Filii et mitti a Filio; sed in ratione et revelatione differunt. #Moreover the cognition of this article has (its) foundation from Scripture, (its) progress [profectum] and/or increment from reason, but its consummation from Revelation. The Greeks and Latins agree in the authority of Scripture, which says, that the Holy Spirit is of the Son and is sent by the Son; but in reason and revelation they differ. ##In ratione quidem intelligendi. Nam cum Scriptura dicat; Spiritum sanctum procedere, Graeci ad intelligendum uti sunt alio modo et alia similitudine processionis, alio modo Latini. Nam cum processio dicatur in creaturis motus localis ab uno in alium et dicatur motus causalis unius ex alio, Graeci intellexerunt processionem primo modo, ab uno in alium; Latini vero secundo modo. Et in hoc melius intellexerunt Latini quam Graeci, quia comparaverunt processionem aeternam processionem magis spirituali; et ideo magis similiter comparaverunt, et sic melius. ##In the reckoning of what exactly is to be understood [ratione quidem intelligendi]. For since Scripture says, that the Holy Spirit proceeds, the Greeks have used another manner and another similitude of procession to understand (it), the Latins another manner. For since procession among creatures, (it is) is said (to be) a local movement from one into the other and is said (to be) a causal movement of one out of another, the Greeks have understood the Procession in the first manner, from one into another; the Latins, however, in the second manner. And in this the Latins have understood (it) better than the Greeks, because they have compared the eternal Procession in a more spiritual manner; and for that reason they have compared it in a more similar manner, and thus better. ##Similiter, Scriptura dicit, Spiritum sanctum per spirationem procedere. Et cum duplex sit spiratio, scilicet flatus exterioris et amoris interioris, Graeci comparaverunt Spiritum spirationi flatus exterioris; sed Latini spirationi amoris interioris; et ideo Latini melius, quia spiritualiori et similiori similitudini aptaverunt. #Similarly, Scripture says, that the Holy Spirit proceeds through spiration. And since spiration is twofold, namely of the exterior breath and of interior love, the Greeks have compared the Spirit to the spiration of the exterior breath, but the Latins to the spiration of interior love; and for that reason the Latins (have done so) better, because they have adapted (their speech) in a more spiritual manner and by a more similar similitude. ##Similiter, cum Scriptura dicat, Spiritum sanctum procedere ut nexum et communionem, et duplex possit esse nexus, vel sicut medium iungens unum, . . . #Similarly, since Scripture says, that the Holy Spirit proceeds as a nexus and communion (of the Father and the Son), and there can be a nexus in a twofold manner, just as a medium joining one, . . . ##10 Aliqui codd. ut G X Z vel habet actum quem, vel ut K T habet actum et. 20 Vers. 6. 30 Vat. cum aliquibus mss. omittit semel Filius, sed contra alios codd. ut A F G H K M T V etc. cum ed. 1. 40 Vers. 26, in quo textu contra Vulgatam et antiquiores codd. omittit Vat. a Patre, sicuti et paulo post bis habet supra loco super. 50 E vetustioribus mss. et ed. 1 supplevimus male omissum alii. 60 Vers. 14. 70 Mox, consentientibus antiquis mss. et ed. 1, posuimus hoc pro quo. 70 Codd. aa bb adiiciunt ab alio. 80 Unus alterve cod. ut S alio. 90 Aliqui codd. ut H P Q Y originis. 100 Relinquimus cum Vat. ac ed. 1 et aliquibus mss. orta, licet maior pars codd. cum edd. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 habent tota, quod minus contextui correspondet. 110 Sequimur plures codd. ut F H I K P Q T etc. et ed. 1 loco conservationem ponendo consummationem, quod et

gradationi membrorum divisionis et subnexis magis correspondet. Cod. X confirmationem. Paulo infra post conveniunt codd. inter se dissentiunt; maior pars eorum ut A C F G I L O R S V W X Z etc. pro quae habet quia; plures deinde ut C I L O R dicunt loco dicit. Nonnulli codd. ut A S T V X aa minus congrue Nam Scriptura dicit. Paulo infra multi codd. cum ed. 1 omittunt verba et alia. Codd. aa bb ab illo. Cod. K secundum veritatem, cod. V secundum rationes pro simili. Sacra Scriptura canonica hoc non dicit expressis verbis, sed implicite et ex Ss. Patrum interpretatione. Cfr. d. 10. a. 2. q. 3. et 2, et hic ad 5. Mox fide multorum mss. ut A F G H K S T W X Y Z etc. et ed. 1 substituiamus Et cum loco Sed cum, et paulo infra comparaverunt pro comparant. Propter repetitionem verborum flatus exterioris et amoris interioris aliqui codd. hic sive omittendo sive permutando erraverunt. Ex pluribus mss. ut H M N P Q aa (T ee ff in margine) adiecimus unum, pro quo ed. 1 habet alterum. Some codices, such as G X Z, either have the Father has an act whom He does not communicate to Him [Pater habet actum quem etc.] or, as K and T, have the Father has the act and He does not . . . [Pater habet actum et etc.]. Verse 6.3 The Vatican edition, together with some manuscripts, omits the Son one time, but contrary to other codices, such as A F G H K M T V etc together with edition 1. Verse 26, in which text contrary to the Vulgate and the more ancient codices, the Vatican edition omits from the Father [a Patre], just as a little afterwards it twice has above [supra] in place of over [super]. From the older manuscripts and edition 1 we have supplied the badly omitted an Other [alii]. Verse 14. Then, consenting with the ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have put this (verse) [hoc] in place of which (verse) [quo]. Codices aa and bb add from the Other [ab alio]. One or the other of the codices, such as S, have an other [alio]. Some codices, such as H P Q and Y, have and its origin, it must be noted, that [et originis eius . . . quod]. We have left, with the Vatican edition and edition 1 and some of the manuscripts, has arisen a [orta est], though the greater part of the codices together with editions 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 have there is an entire [tota est], which corresponds less with the context. We follow the very many codices, such as F H I K P Q T etc. and edition 1, by putting consummation [consummationem] in place of conservation [conservationem], which corresponds more with steps of the division of the members and with the subjoined. Codex X has confirmation [confirmationem]. A little below this after agree [conveniunt] the codices disagree amongst themselves; the greater part of them, such as A C F G I L O R S V W X Z etc. have because [quia] in place of which (authority) [quae]; very many, such as C I L O R, then have they say [dicunt] for says [dicit]. Not a few codices, such as A S T V X and aa, less congruously have For Scripture says [Nam Scriptura dicit]. A little below this many codices together with edition 1 omit the words and . . . another [et alia]. Codices aa and bb have from that [ab illo]. Codex K has according to the truth [secundum veritatem], codex V has according to reasons [secundum rationes], in place of in a . . . similar manner [simili]. The canonical Scriptures do not say this expressly, but implicitly and according to the interpretation of the holy Fathers. Cf. d. 10, a. 2, q. 3 and 2, and here in reply to n. 5. Then trusting in the many manuscripts, such as A F G H K S T W X Y Z etc. and edition 1, we have substituted But since [Sed cum] with And since [Et cum], and a little below compare [comparant] with have compared. On account of the repetition of the words of the exterior breath and of interior love [flatus exterioris et amoris interioris] some codices have erred either by omitting or a permutation. From very many manuscripts, such as H M N P Q aa (T ee and ff in the margin), we have inserted one [unum], in place of which edition 1 has the other [alterum]. p. 212 alteri, vel sicut extremum, in quo coniunguntur; Graeci comparaverunt primo modo, Latini secundo, et ideo spiritualiori modo et similiori, quia ille nexus magis habet similitudinem personae. to the other, and/or just as an extreme, in which they are conjoined; the Greeks compared in the first manner, the Latins in the second, and for that reason in a more spiritual and more similar manner, because that nexus has to a greater extent the similitude of a person. Quia ergo differentiam habuerunt in ratione, et Latini spiritualius et convenientius comparaverunt; ideo ex ratione sua sunt elevati, et per hoc ad intelligentiam Scripturae dispositi, et ideo manifesta revelatione edocti sunt de Spiritus sancti processione. Graeci

vero, quia similitudines differentes et minus proprias aptabant, ideo sunt sua ratione depressi; et non valentes intelligere, Spiritum a Verbo procedere, nec in alium ab aeterno procedere, arctaverunt Scripturam ad intelligendum de processione temporali, et ideo sibi viam revelationis clausurunt. Haec est ergo ratio diversitatis in huius articuli cognitione. Therefore, because they had a difference in reckoning, and (because) the Latins compared (it) in a more spiritual and more fitting manner; for that reason they were elevated by their reckoning, and through this disposed to understand the Scripture, and for that reason were instructed by manifest revelation concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit. The Greeks, however, because they adapted different and less proper (manners of speech), for that reason were depressed by their reckoning; and not prevailing to understand, that the Spirit proceeds from the Word, and does not proceeds into the Other from eternity, constrained Scripture to be understood concerning the temporal procession, and for that reason closed off to themselves the way to revelation. This is, therefore, the reason for the diversity in the cognition of this article. Controversia vero venit ex huius articuli professione. Professio vero huius2 articuli venit ab Ecclesia Latinorum ex triplici causa, videlicet ex fidei veritate, ex periculi necessitate et ex Ecclesiae auctoritate. Fides dictabat hoc, et periculi necessitas imminebat, ne forte aliquis hoc negaret,3 in quod periculum inciderunt Graeci; et Ecclesiae auctoritas aderat: et ideo sine mora exprimi debebat. However the controversy came from the profession of this article. But the profession of this2 article came from the Church of the Latins from a threefold cause, namely, from the truth of the Faith, from the necessity of danger, and from the authority of the Church. The Faith dictated this, and the necessity of danger was imminent, lest perchance someone deny this, into which danger the Greeks fell; and the authority of the Church upheld it [aderat]: and for that reason it ought to have been expressed without delay. Negatio vero huius articuli venit ex triplici causa, scilicet ex ignorantia, ex superbia et4 pertinacia. Ex ignorantia, quia nec Scripturam intellexerunt nec habuerunt congruam rationem nec apertam revelationem. Ex superbia, quia, cum reputarent se sciolos et vocati non fuerunt,5 noluerunt profiteri quod non erat per eos inventum. Ex pertinacia, ne convincerentur et irrationabiliter moveri viderentur, invenerunt pro se rationes contra veritatem: et ideo suam sententiam defendere ausi sunt et auctoritati Ecclesiae Romanae obviare; et ideo facti sunt haeretici, quia denegant6 fidei veritatem, et schismatici, quia recesserunt ab Ecclesiae unitate. But the denial of this article came from a threefold cause, that is, from ignorance, from pride and4 pertinacity. From ignorance, because they neither understood Scripture nor had a fitting reason nor an open revelation. From pride, because, since they reputed themselves to be all-knowing [sciolos] and had not been called (to a Council),5 they did not want to profess what had not been invented by them. From pertinacity, lest they be convinced and seem to be moved irrationally, they invented for themselves reasons against the truth: and for that reason dared to defend their own sentence and to obviate the authority of the Roman Church; and for that reason have become heretics, because they reject [denegant]6 a truth of the Faith, and schematics, because they have withdrawn from the unity of the Church. Sed quia mos est haeticorum et schismaticorum, cum se non possunt rationibus commuere, adversam partem accusare; ideo nos accusant, et redarguunt tanquam curiosos et tanquam excommunicatos et schismaticos. Curiosos,7 quia sine huius articuli professione salus erat. Quare ergo intromiserunt se Latini hoc perquirere, quod non fuit necessarium? But because the custom of heretics and schismatics, when they cannot completely defend themselves with reasons, accuse the opposed party; for that reason they accuse and argue back at us [redarguunt] as curios men and as excommunicates and schismatics. Curios men,7 because without the profession of this article there was salvation. Why, therefore, did the Latins permit themselves to thoroughly search into this, which was not necessary (for salvation)? Sed ad hoc patet responsio, quia8 opportunum fuit propter periculum in quod ipsi inciderunt. But to this the response is clear, that8 it was opportune on account of the danger into which they themselves have fallen. Similiter, dicunt nos excommunicatos, quia Sumbola corrumpimus, in quibus per sanctos Patres sub excommunicationis poena hoc erat



prohibitum.##Similarly, they say that we (are) excommunicated, because we have corrupted the Symbols, in which this had been prohibited through the holy Fathers under the pain of excommunication.##Et ad hoc patet responsio per praedicta, quia non corrumpimus, sed perficimus;9 nec sententia lata est contra perficientes, sed contra corrumpentes. ¶Vel potest dici, sicut dicit Anselmus,10 quod novum edidimus; et hoc quidem facere potuimus, quia Romana Ecclesia plenitudinem potestatis a Petro, Apostolorum principe, acceperat, in qua nulla Patrum sententia nec interdictum potuit nec arctare nec ei praeiudicare nec ligare eam ad aliquid.##And to this the response is clear through the aforesaid, because we do not corrupt, but rather perfect;9 nor is there a sentence levied against perfectors, but rather against corruptors. ¶And/or it can be said, as (St.) Anselm says,10 that we have put forth something new; and this indeed we could do, because the Roman Church has accepted from (St.) Peter the Apostle the plenitude of power, in which no sentence nor interdict of the Fathers could either restrain [arctare] nor prejudge the matter [ei] nor bind it regarding anything.##Similiter dicunt nos schismaticos, quia a nobis incepit12 divisio; cum enim hoc vellemus asserere, noluimus eos vocare.##Similarly they say that we (are) schismatics, because the division began12 from us; for when we wanted to assert this, we did not want to call them (to a Council).##Et ad hoc responderi potest pro Latinis, quod eos vocare non fuit opportunum ¶ ¶ quia Ecclesia sine eis hoc poterat ¶ ¶ et hoc,13 ¶ quia erat laboriosum propter distantiam, erat infructuosum, quia iam non erat in Graecis sapientia tanta, sicut fuerat, immo ad Latinos transierat, erat nihilominus periculosum, quia quod pro certo habendum erat periculum erat ducere in dubium. ##And one can respond to this on behalf of the Latins, that it was not opportune to call them ¶ ¶ because the Church could (do this) without them ¶ ¶ and this,13 because it was laborious on account of the distance, was not

unfruitful, because there was no longer the great wisdom among the Greeks, as had been, nay it had passed over to the Latins, it was nevertheless dangerous, because it was dangerous to put [ducere] into doubt what was to be held certain [pro certo habendum erat].##Et sic patet, quod frivolae sunt eorum accusationes. ¶Ad rationes autem, intellectis quae dicta sunt, facile est respondere.##And thus it is clear, that their accusations are frivolous. ¶But to (their) reasons, having understood what has been said, it is easy to respond.##1. Ad illud ergo quod obiicitur, quod processio est ab uno in alium; dicendum, quod verum est de processione locali, sed non est verum de processione causali, sicut infra melius patebit;14 cum procedere in alium sit dupliciter, aut quia in alium tendit sicut15 obiectum; et sic Spiritus sanctus est amor, quo Filius amat Patrem, sicut e converso; si autem sic dicatur procedere in aliquem, ut ab eo recipiatur, omnino stultus est intellectus. ¶Est enim dicere, quod amor, . . .#1. To that, therefore, which is objected, that procession is from one into an other; it must be said, that it is true concerning local procession, but it is not true concerning causal procession, just as will be more clear below;14 since ¶to proceed into an other ¶ is twofold, either because it tends into an other as15 an object; and in this manner the Holy Spirit is the Love, by which the Son loves the Father, just as (is true) the other way around; but if He is said to proceed into another in this manner, as to be received by him, it has been understood in an entirely stupid manner [omnino stultus est intellectus].¶ For (this) is to say, that the Love, . . .##1 ¶ Multi codd. omittunt modo, quod Vat. transponit post secundo.2 ¶ Fide mss. et ed. 1 supplevimus huius. ¶Mox aliqui codd. ut I Z cum ed. 1 Latina pro Latinorum, et paulo infra multi codd. ut A F G H T etc. cum ed. 1 post necessitate addunt nobiscum particulam et.3 ¶ Vat. contra antiquiores codd. et ed. 1 aliqui hoc negarent.4 ¶ Ed. 1 addit ex.5 ¶ Ed. 1 defuerunt loco non fuerunt. ¶Paulo infra post pertinacia codd. P Q adiiciunt quia.6 ¶ Vat. cum cod. cc negant, sed contra alios codd. et ed. 1.7 Cod. V Tanquam curiosos. 8 ¶ Praeter fidem mss. et sex primarum edd. in Vat. omittitur quia, sicuti et paulo infra contra antiquiores codd. et edd. 1, 4, 5 praepositio in.9 ¶ Aliqui codd. ut K X Z corrumpimus, sed perfecimus; aliqui ut G H I S cum ed. 1 corrumpimus, sed perfecimus; alii exhibent cum Vat. lectionem nostram.10 Libr. de Process. Spri. c. 22: ¶ Respondemus, nos illud non corrupisse, sed aliud novum edidisse. ¶ ¶ Mox ex pluribus codd. ut X Y aa cum ed. 1 et hoc quidem loco quod quidem posuimus, quod

confirmatur ex incongrua lectione aliorum codd. et quod quidem.<sup>11</sup> Vat. contra multos codd. ut A F G I L O T W etc. et ed. 1 quam, ac praeter fidem mss. et ed. 1 post interdictum addit ponere. <sup>12</sup>Ed. 1 interdicere pro interdictum.<sup>12</sup> Praeferimus lectionem nonnullorum mss. ut H I W etc. incepit loco incipit.<sup>13</sup> Auctoritate plurimorum mss. et ed. 1 supplevimus ab ed. Vat. omisum hoc, sub quod intelligas: non fuit opportunum. <sup>14</sup>Mox post infructuosum consensu mss. et ed. 1 expunximus verba propter insipientiam.<sup>14</sup> Dist. 14. a. 1. q. 1. <sup>15</sup>Unus alterve cod. ut H (a secunda manu) cum ed 1 in obiectum, post quod cod. X addit aut quia in alium tendit ita, quod ab eo recipiatur; si quia in alium tendit sicut obiectum.##<sup>16</sup> Many codices omit modo [Trans. note. <sup>17</sup>manner<sup>17</sup>, since it is usually presumed in the sense of the ablative of manner.], which the Vatican transposes after the second [secundo].<sup>20</sup> Trusting the manuscripts and edition 1, we have supplied this [huius]. <sup>21</sup>Then some codices, such as I and Z, together with edition 1 have the Latin Church [Ecclesia Latina] for the Church of the Latins [Ecclesia Latinorum], and a little below this many codices, such as A F G H T etc., together with edition 1 after necessity of danger [periculi necessitate] add with us the particle and [et].<sup>30</sup> The Vatican edition, contrary to the more ancient codices and edition 1, has some deny this [aliqui hoc negarent].<sup>40</sup> Edition 1 adds from [ex].<sup>50</sup> Edition 1 has having been called they were missing [vocati defuerunt] for they were not called [vocati non fuerunt]. <sup>60</sup>A little below this after pertinacity [pertinacia] codices P and Q add because [quia].<sup>60</sup> The Vatican edition together with codex cc has deny [negant], but contrary to the other codices and edition 1.<sup>70</sup> Codex V has As curios men [Tamquam curiosos].<sup>80</sup> Not trusting in the manuscripts and the six first editions, there is omitted in the Vatican edition the that [quia], just as a little below this contrary to the more ancient codices and editions 1, 4 and 5, it omits the preposition into [in].<sup>90</sup> Some codices, such as K X and Z, have we have not corrupted, but <sup>100</sup>rather have perfected [non corrupimus, sed perfecimus]; others, such as G H I S together with edition 1, have we do not corrupt, but rather have perfected [non corrumpimus, sed perfecimus]; others, together with the Vatican edition, exhibit our reading.<sup>100</sup> On the Procession of the Holy Spirit, ch. 22:<sup>110</sup> We reply, that we have not corrupted it, but rather have put out something new. <sup>120</sup>Then from very many codices, such as X Y and aa, together with edition 1, we have put and this indeed [et hoc quidem] in place of which indeed [quod quidem], which is confirmed from the incongruous reading of the other codices and which indeed [et quod quidem].<sup>110</sup> The Vatican edition, contrary to many codices, such as A F G I L O T W etc. and edition 1, has into which [in quam], and not trusting in the manuscripts and edition 1, has to be able [ponere] in place of could [potuit]. <sup>120</sup>Edition 1 has to interdict [interdicere] for interdict [interdictum].<sup>120</sup> We prefer the reading of not a few manuscripts such as H I W etc., which have began [incipit] in place of is beginning [incipit].<sup>130</sup> On the authority of very many manuscripts and edition 1, we have supplied from the Vatican edition the omitted this [hoc], by which we understand: it was not opportune.<sup>140</sup> Then after unfruitful [infructuosum], with the consent of the manuscripts and edition 1, we have expunged the words on account of (their) foolishness [propter insipientiam].<sup>140</sup> Distinction 14, a. 1, q. 1. <sup>150</sup>One or the other of the codices, such as H (in a second hand), together with edition 1 have into [in], after which codex X adds either because it thus tends into an other, because it is received by it; if because into an other it tends as an object [aut quia in alium tendit ita, quod ab eo recipiatur; si quia in alium tendit sicut obiectum].###p. 213qui est Spiritus sanctus, oriatur a Patre et susistat in Filio, sicut rivus oritur a fonte et requiescit in lacu profundo.<sup>1</sup>which is the Holy Spirit, arises from the Father and subsists in the Son, just as a river rises from a spring [fonte] and rests in a deep lake.<sup>1</sup>##<sup>2</sup>. Ad illud quod obiicitur de spiratione, quod praecedat verbum; dicendum, quod verum est de exteriori verbo, et non de interiori:<sup>1</sup> et exterius<sup>2</sup> non est simile.<sup>2</sup>. To that which is objected concerning spiration, that it precedes the word; it must be said that it is true concerning an exterior word, and not (true) concerning an interior one:<sup>1</sup> and the exterior (word)<sup>2</sup> is not similar (to the divine Procession).##<sup>3</sup>. Ad illud quod obiicitur de nexu, dicendum, quod nexus non habet rationem medii, sed rationem tertii, quidquid<sup>3</sup> aliqui voluerunt dicere, quod locum tenet et medii et tertii; et

voluerunt sustinere opinionem Graecorum et Latinorum et distinguunt duplicem modum procedendi, scilicet in alium, et sic procedit a Patre; vel ab alio, et sic procedit a Patre et Filio. ¶ Istud<sup>4</sup> est exsufflandum hodie, quia non habet intellectum sanum; immo omnino eodem modo procedit ab utroque, et tamen utriusque nexus est, sicut ponitur exemplum de duobus lignis, ex quibus procederet una flamma.##3. To that which is objected concerning a nexus, it must be said, that a nexus does not have the reckoning of a ¶ means¶, but a reckoning of a ¶ third (member)¶, regardless of what<sup>3</sup> some wanted to say, that it holds the place both of a ¶ means¶ and of a ¶ third (member)¶; and they wanted to sustain the opinion of the Greeks and the Latins and they distinguish a twofold manner of proceeding, that is, into an other, and in this manner He proceeds from the Father; and/or from an other, and in this manner He proceeds from the Father and the Son. ¶ Today that (argument of theirs)<sup>4</sup> must be discarded [exsufflandum], because it does not have a sane understanding; nay He proceeds in entirely the same manner from Each, and yet is the Nexus of Each, just as is depicted in the example [ponitur exemplum] of two pieces of wood, from which proceed one flame.##4. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod ab altero sufficienter, ergo etc.; dicendum, quod istud verum esset, si essent diversa principia Spiritus sancti; quod non est verum, sicut infra patebit.5 ¶ Unde sicut non valet hoc argumentum: ¶ Pater creat, et Filius similiter; et Pater est sufficiens in creando: ¶ ergo Filius superfluit; ¶¶¶ quia sunt unum principium in creando ¶¶ similiter solvendum est in proposito.##4. To that which is objected, that from the other sufficiently, ergo etc.; it must be said, that that would be true, if there were diverse principles of the Holy Spirit; which is not true, just as will be clear below.5 ¶ Whence just as this argument is not valid: ¶ The Father creates, and the Son similarly; and the Father is sufficient in creating. ¶ therefore the Son is superfluous; ¶¶ because there is one principle in creating ¶¶ similarly it is to be solved in the proposed.##5. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod non reperitur in Scriptura; dicendum, quod si verba non reperiantur, reperitur tamen sensus, sicut in obiiciendo monstratum est. ¶ Tamen argumentum non valet: ¶ non reperitur in Scriptura, ergo non est verum; quia

Scripturae mos est, quaedam tacere propter insinuandam humilitatem: ¶ unde Dominus, volens nos erudire ad humilitatem, omne quod suum est Patri attribuit, sicut dicit Ioannis septimo:6 ¶ Mea doctrina non est mea. ¶ Similiter dicit Ioannis decimo quinto:7 ¶ Qui a Patre procedit, loquens de Spiritu sancto, et tamen ipse subiungit:8 ¶ omnia, quae Pater habet, mea sunt: et ideo argumentum non valet.##5. To that which is objected, that it is not found in Scripture; it must be said, that if the words are not found, yet the sense (of them) is found, just as has been demonstrated in the objection. ¶ However the argument is not valid: ¶ it is not found in Scripture, therefore it is not true¶; because the custom of Scripture is, that it is silent regarding certain (things) on account of instilling [insinuandam] humility: ¶ wherefore the Lord, wanting to instruct us unto [ad] humility, everything [omne] which is His He attributes to the Father, just as He says in (the Gospel of St.) John, (chapter) seven:6 ¶ My doctrine is not mine. ¶ Similarly He says in (the Gospel of St.) John, (chapter) ten:7 ¶ Who proceeds from the Father, speaking of the Holy Spirit, and yet He Himself subjoins:8 ¶ all, which the Father has, are mine: and for that reason the argument is not valid.##6. Ad illud quod obiicitur de Conciliis, dicendum, quod nec in Conciliis illis sunt omnia instituta, quae spectant ad mores, nec etiam omnia dicta, quae ad fidem pertinent; sicut in Symbolo, quod cantatur in missa, nihil dicitur de descensu ad inferos. ¶ Sed nunquid<sup>9</sup> latuit sanctos Patres processio Spiritus sancti a Filio ? et si non latuit, quare non dixerunt ? ¶ Credo quod non latuit, sicut patet per antiquos Graecos, quorum Magister adducit auctoritatem in littera;10 sed tamen non fuit expressum, quia non erat opus. ¶ Nullus enim negabat nec negare volebat. ¶ Sed haeretici multa, quae erant implicita fidei nostrae, sua importunitate compulerunt explicare; et sic patet illud.##6. To that which is objected concerning Councils, it must be said, that neither in those Council were all (things) instituted, which regard [spectant ad] customs, nor even all (things) said, which pertain to the Faith, just as in the Creed [Symbolo], which is chanted at Mass, nothing is said of the descent to the lower regions. ¶ But did not<sup>9</sup> the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son lie hidden from the holy Fathers? and if it did not lie hidden, why did they not

speak (of it)? I believe that it did not lie hidden, just as is clear through the ancient Greek (Fathers), the authority of whom Master (Peter) adduces in the text;10 but nevertheless [tamen] it was not expressed, because there was no need. For none used to deny nor waned to deny (it). But heretics by their importunity compelled (us) to explicate many (things), which had been implicit in our Faith; and thus it is clear.##7. 8. Ad illud quod obiicitur de auctoritate Dionysii et Gregorii, dicendum, quod non est omnimoda similitudo, sed maior dissimilitudo. Attenditur autem similitudo in hoc; scilicet quantum ad plenitudinem fontalitatis in Patre et in divisione personarum emanantium ab eo, et in receptione influentiae in creatura; non tamen est omnimoda similitudo quantum ad modum emanandi; et sic patet illud.##7. 8. To that which is objected concerning the authority of (Sts.) Dionysius and Gregory, it must be said, that there is not a omnimodal similitude, but a greater dissimilitude. Moreover the similitude is tended toward in this; that is, as much as regards the plenitude of fontality in the Father and in the division of the Persons emanating from Him, and in the reception of influence in the creature; yet there is not a omnimodal similitude as much as regards the manner of emanating; and this it is clear.##9. Ad illud quod obiicitur de Damasceno, dicendum, quod non est in ista parte ei assentiendum, sicut enim intellexi, ipse fuit in tempore, quando orta est contentio. Unde non est in hoc sustinendus, quia simpliciter fuit Graecus, tamen ipse caute loquitur. Unde non dicit, quod Spiritus non sit a Filio, sed dicit, non dicimus a Filio, quia Graeci non confitebantur, nec tamen negabant; sed modo eorum maledicta progenies addidit ad paternam dementia et dicit, quod non procedit a Filio nisi temporaliter. Et ideo tanquam hereticos et schismaticos eos damnat Romana Ecclesia.##9. To that which is objected concerning (St. John ) Damascene, it must be said, that there is no agreement on their side regarding him, for as I understand, he himself lived [fuit] in the time, when contention has arisen. Whence one must not sustain in this, simply that because he was a Greek, yet he spoke cautiously. Whence he does not say, that the Spirit is not from the Son, but he says, we do not say from the Son, because the Greeks did not use to confess, nor yet deny (this); but now their cursed progeny has added madness to a paternal (custom) and says, that He does not proceed from the Son except temporally. And for that reason the Roman Church damns them as heretics and schismatics.###10 Quodmodo ista similitudo intelligenda sit, apte explicat S. Anselmus, de Process. Spir. sancti, c. 17: Constat quia una eademque aqua est, quae et fons et rivus et lacus dicitur, non tres aquae, quamvis tres sint, fons, rivus et lacus. Discernamus itaque inter fontem, rivum et lacum, et videamus quid singula haec, cum tria sint, in una intelligantur aqua. In fonte quidem aqua de abyssu ascendens ebullit; in rivo de fonte descendens fluit; in lacu colligitur et manet. Per fontem ergo intelligitur aqua de abyssu ebulliens; per rivum, quia de fonte fluit; per lacum, quia simul ibi coadunatur. Videmus autem quia rivus non est de hoc, unde aqua fons dicitur, sed de hoc, quod est, id est de aqua; nec lacus est de hoc, unde aqua dicitur fons aut rivus, sed de ipsa aqua, quae una et eadem est in fonte et rivo. Non ergo de hoc, unde differunt fons et rivus, sed de hoc, in quo unum sunt, lacus existit. Si ergo non magis fons est hoc, unde lacus est quam rivus, nequit intelligi lacus magis esse de fonte quam de rivo. Sic itaque, cum dicitur Deus Pater aut Filius aut Spiritus sanctus, una in tribus intelligitur essentia et unus Deus . . . sed in Patre intelligitur gignens, in Filio genitus, et in Spiritu sancto singulari quodam et ineffabili modo procedens.20 Fide mss. et ed. 1 pro ideo substituimus exterius scil. verbum, deinde supple: processioni divinae; cod. R non enim est simile de interiori et externis (exteriori); cod. Z post exterius addit et interius.30 Plurimis mss. et ed. 1 refragantibus, Vat. quamquam.40 Vat. contra mss. et ed. 1 Sed istud.50 Quaest. seq.60 Vers. 16.70 Vers. 26.80 Ibid. c. 16, 15, in quo textu Vulgata loco quae habet quaecumque.90 Lectio plurimum codd. ut H I L O ee ff et ed. 1, in qua nunquid loco nunquam ponitur, a nobis electa est, quia subnexis magis correpondet.100 Cap. 2. 00 Paulo ante Vat. corrupte et praeter fidem antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1 post sicut omittit patet.110 Cod. Y in distinctione, quae lectio explicat, quo sensu vocabulum divisione sumendum sit.###10 How this similitude is to be understood, is aptly explained by St. Anselm, On the Procession of the Holy Spirit, ch. 17: It is established that one and the same

is the water, which is called both *a spring* and *a river* and *a lake*; not three waters, although there be three, the spring, the river and the lake. We also discern among the spring, river and lake, and we see that each of these, though they are three, are understood as [in] one water. Indeed in the spring the water ascending from the deep bubbles up; in the river descending from the spring it flows; in the lake it is gathers and remains. Therefore through *spring* there is understood *water bubbling up from the deep*; through *river*, that it flows from the spring; through *lake*, that there it is united together. Moreover we see that a river is not of that, whence water is called *a spring*, but of that, which it is, that is of water; nor is the lake of that, whence water is called *a spring* or *a river*, but of water itself, which is one and the same in spring and river. Therefore not from that, whence spring and river differ, but of that, in which they are one, does a lake exist. If, therefore, it is not more a spring, whence the lake is, than a river, *a lake* cannot be understood to be more from a spring than from a river. So also, when there is said, *God the Father or the Son or the Holy Spirit*, there is understood one Essence among Three and one God . . . but in the Father there is understood the One begetting, in the Son the One Begotten, and in the Holy Spirit in a certain singular and ineffable manner the One Proceeding.<sup>2</sup> Trusting in the manuscripts and edition 1 we have substituted exterior [exterius] for for that reason [ideo], namely *exterior word*, then supply: *divine procession*; codex R has for it is not similar concerning the interior and the external ones [non enim est simile de interiorir et externis]; cod. Z after exterior [exterius] adds and interior [interius].<sup>3</sup> Disagreeing with very many manuscripts and edition 1, the Vatican edition has although [quamquam].<sup>4</sup> The Vatican edition, contrary to the manuscripts and edition 1, has But that (argument of theirs) [Sed istud].<sup>5</sup> See the following Question.<sup>6</sup> Verse 16.<sup>7</sup> Verse 26.<sup>8</sup> Ibid., 16:15, in which text the Vulgate in place of which [quae] has whatsoever [quaecumque].<sup>9</sup> The reading of very many codices, such as H I L O ee ff and edition 1, in which not [nunquid] is put in the place of never [numquam], has been chosen by us, because it corresponds more with what is subjoined.<sup>10</sup> Chapter 2. A little before this the Vatican edition, having been corrupted, and not trusting in the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, omits is clear [patet] after just as [sicut].<sup>11</sup> Codex Y has in distinction [in distinctione], which reading explains, in which sense the word division [divisione] is to be taken.###p. 214SCHOLIION.#SCHOLIUM##I. Haec conclusio, quam schismatici Graeci reiiciunt, habetur in Symbolo Concilii XI Toletani (a. 675) et definita est ut articulus fidei decretis plurium Conciliorum, scil. Barensis (1098), Lugdunensis II. et Florentini in decreto unionis. Ceterum etiam formula apud Graecos usitata, scil. Patrem per Filium spirare Spiritum sanctum, a Concilio Florentino (Decret. unionis) approbata et in hoc sensu explicata est: ut per hoc significetur, Filium quoque esse secundum Graecos quidem causam, secundum Latinos vero principium substantiae Spiritus sancti, sicut et Patrem. Et quoniam omnia, quae Patris sunt, ipse Pater unigenito Filio suo gignendo dedit, praeter esse Patrem, hoc ipsum, quod Spiritus sanctus procedit ex Filio, ipse Filius a Patre aeternaliter habet, a quo aeternaliter etiam genitus est .#I. This conclusion, which the schismatic Greeks reject, is found in the Creed of the 11th Council of Toledo (A.D. 675) and was defined as an article of faith by the decrees of very many Councils, namely of Bari (A.D. 1098), the Second Council of Lyons [A.D. 1274] and the Council of Florence [A. D. 1439] in its Decree of Union [incipit: *Cantate Domino*]. But the formula used also among the Greeks, namely, that the Father spirates the Holy Spirit through the Son, was approved by the Council of Florence (Decree of Union) and is explained in this sense: that through this there is signified, that the Son, according to the Greeks, is indeed a cause, according to the Latins, however, a principle of the substance of the Holy Spirit, just as even the Father. And since everything, which belongs to the Father, the Father Himself has given to His own Only-Begotten Son by begetting Him, besides the *Being* [esse] of the Father, this very thing, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from [ex] the Son, the Son Himself has eternally from the Father, from whom eternally He has also been begotten.##II. S. Doctor (in corp. ante med.) dicit, quod Latini manifesta revelatione edocti sint; hoc tamen non est intelligendum de aliqua nova revelatione, quae aliquod

addat ad depositum fidei, sed uti patet ex contextu, de charismate veritatis, quo recte expositum est depositum fidei, in quo saltem implicite hoc dogma iam erat revelatum.##II. The Seraphic Doctor (p. 212, second paragraph) says, that the Latins have been instructed by manifest revelation; this, however, is not to be understood of a new revelation, which adds anything to the Deposit of Faith, but as is clear from the context, concerns a charism of truth, by which the Deposit of Faith has been rightly expounded, in which this dogma had already been at least implicitly revealed.##III. Respectu ad solut. ad 3. dicit Dionys. Carth. (hic q. 1. in fine): Distinctionem quoque Alexandri, in principio responsionis ad quaestionem hanc positam, dicit Bonaventura nunc exsufflandam, affirmantis, Spiritum sanctum eodem modo procedere a Patre et Filio, quemadmodum a duobus lignis una progreditur flamma. Errat autem doctissimus et sanctissimus vir. S. Bonav. enim non exsufflat illam distinctionem in se, sed tantum usum eius, quem nonnulli fecerunt putantes, aliter procedere Spiritum sanctum a Patre, aliter a Filio. Seraphicum Doctorem plene consentire suo magistro, probat locus sequens Alexandri (S. p. I. q. 43. m. 4), quem eo libentius hic describimus, quia in edd. gravi errore laborat. Desunt enim in eis verba italicis litteris a nobis distincta: quia ex eo sequeretur, quod procederet a Filio, et immediate post edd. habent inconvenies loco conveniens. Hac lectione sensus omnino perturbatur. Correximus hunc errorem ex cod. ms. biblioth. nation. Florentia, in fol. membr., saec. XIV, sig. I. III. 9, fol. 75. recto; est ibi q. 15. m. 12. a. 5.##III. In reference to the solution to n. 3, (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian (here in q. 1 at the end) says: Also the distinction of Alexander (of Hales), posited at the beginning of the response to this question, which affirms that the Holy Spirit proceeds in the same manner from the Father and the Son, in the manner which one flame steps forth from two logs, Bonaventure says is now to be disregarded. But this most learned and holy man errs. For St. Bonaventure does not disregard that distinction in itself, but only its use, which not a few thinkers understood as, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father in one manner, and from the Son in another manner. That the Seraphic Doctor fully consents with his teacher, the following passage of Alexander (Summa., p. I, q. 43, m. 4) proves, which for this reason we describe here more freely, because in the editions it is belabored by a grave error. For there are lacking among those italicized letters, the words distinguished by us: because there would follow from this, that He proceeds from the Son, and immediately after this the editions have unfitting [inconveniens] in place of fitting [conveniens]. By this reading the sense is entirely distorted. We have corrected this error from the Manuscript Codex of the National Library of Florence, in the folio member, 14th Century, sig. I. III. 9, fol. 75. recto; there in q. 15. m. 12. a. 5:## Dicendum, quod procedere dicitur dupliciter: uno modo dicitur procedere in motu locali, qui motus est ab aliquo in aliquid. Alio modo dicitur procedere in exitu causati a causa vel motus a movente. Secundum primum modum procedere requirit duplicem terminum: a quo et in quem. Secundum modum secundum non requirit nisi unum, scilicet a quo. Unde et secundum hos duos modos potest transsumi ad processionem Spiritus sancti verbum procedendi. Graeci vero verbum procedendi transtulerunt a motu locali; unde processionem Spiritus sancti aeternam intellexerunt ab aliquo in aliquem; et ideo secundum hunc modum non concesserunt, quod procederet Spiritus sanctus a Filio, quia ex eo sequeretur, quod procederet a Filio in Patrem, quod non est conveniens (edd. inconveniens), cum in ipso Patre sit ratio primi principii, et nihil habeat Pater a Filio. Si autem diceretur, quod procederet a Filio in Patrem, videretur Pater aliquid habere a Filio. Sed concesserunt, quod procedat in Filium, et etiam insinuat, quod Filius habet esse a Patre. Latini vero transsumunt verbum procedendi ab exitu sive processu causati a causa. Unde dicunt, quod procedere est ab aliquo exire, quamvis non in aliquem, secundum quod dicitur a mente et notitia procedere amor, quamvis non intelligatur, in aliquid. Et secundum hunc modum dicunt Latini, quod Spiritus sanctus procedit a Patre et Filio, quia exit ab utroque, velut amor a notitia et mente.## It must be said, that to proceed is said in a twofold manner: in one manner to proceed is said in a local movement, which movement is from something into something. In another manner to proceed is said in the going-forth of a caused from a cause and/or a moved from a mover. According to the first manner

¶to proceed¶ requires a twofold terminus:¶ from which and into which. ¶According to the second manner it does not require but one, namely from which. ¶Whence also according to those two manners the verb ¶to proceed¶ can be transferred to the Procession of the Holy Spirit. ¶On the one hand the Greeks have transferred the verb ¶to proceed¶ from local movement; whence they understood the eternal Procession of the Holy Spirit from someone into someone; and for that reason according to this manner they did not concede, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, because there would follow from this, that He proceeds from the Son into the Father, which is not fitting (the editions have ¶unfitting¶), since in the Father Himself is the Reckoning of a First Principle, and the Father has nothing from the Son. ¶Moreover, if one were to say, that He proceeds from the Son into the Father, the Father would seem to have something from the Son.¶ But they have conceded, that He proceeds into the Son, and it is even hinted at (in Sacred Scripture), that the Son has His ¶Being¶ [esse] from the Father. ¶On the other hand, the Latins transfer the verb ¶to proceed¶ from a going-forth or processing of a caused from a cause. ¶Wherefore they say, that ¶to proceed¶ is ¶to go forth from something¶, although not ¶into something¶, according to which love is said to proceed from a mind, though it is not understood (to proceed), into something. ¶And according to this manner (of understanding) the Latins says, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, because He has gone forth from Each, as the Love from the Knowledge and the Mind. ¶##IV. S. Ioannes Damascenus, cuius doctrinam S. Bonav. (hic ad ultim.) asserit non esse in hac re sustinendum, etiam a S. Thom. (S. I. q. 36. a. 2. ad. 3.) erroris accusatur; additur autem, quod a nonnullis excusetur.¶ Sed iam Scot. (hic q. 1.) illum S. Doctorem melius explicat eiusque orthodoxiam in hac re vindicat, quod nunc a theologis communiter est receptum.¶IV. St. John Damascene, whose doctrine St. Bonaventure (here in the last reply) asserts not to be sustained in this matter, is also accused by St. Thomas (Summa, I, q. 36, a. 2, ad 3) of error, but we might add, is excused by not a few. ¶But (Bl. John Duns) Scotus (here in q. 1) better explains that holy Doctor here and vindicates his orthodoxy in the matter, which defense now a days is commonly accepted by theologians.¶V.¶ Argumentum 4. in fundam., quod, negata processione Spiritus sancti a Filio, etiam distinctio utriusque debeat negari, a plerique theologis approbatur, ut ab Alex. Hal., B. Albert., S. Thom., Petr. a Tar., Durand., et fere communiter a sequentibus theologis extra scholam Scot. ¶Tamen contrarium docent Henr. Gand. (Quodl. 5. q. 9.), Scot. (hic q. unic., et Report., hic q. 2.), Dionys. Carth. (hic q. 2.); sed Richard. a Med. (hic q. 2) haerit anceps.¶ Celebris est de hac re controversia inter scholam Scotisticam et Thomisticam aliosque theologos.¶ De argumentis Schotistarum videsis Claud. Frassenium (Scotus academicus, tom. 3. tract. 3. dips. 3. a. 3. q. 2.), Ioan. de Rada (I. contr. 15.), et Franc. Macedo (Collationes doctrinae S. Thomae et Scot., coll. 6. diff. 4.).¶VI.¶ The fourth argument in the fundament, that, having denied the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son, the distinction of each (Person) ought also to be denied, is approved by very many theologians, such as Alexander of Hales, Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), St. Thomas, (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, Durandus, and nearly commonly by the theologians which followed, outside the school of Scotus. ¶However the contrary is taught by Henry of Ghent (Quodlibetals, 5, q. 8), Scotus (here in q. sole, and in the Reportatio, here in q. 2), (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian (here in q. 2); but Richard of Middletown (here in q. 2) adheres to the former. ¶The controversy over this matter among the school of Scotus and Thomas and other theologians, is famous. ¶Concerning the arguments of the Scotists see Claude Frassen (Scotus Academicus, tome 3, tract 3, disputation 3, a 3, q. 2), John de Rada (I. contr. 15), and Francisco Macedo (Collationes doctrinae S. Thomas et Scot., coll. 6, diff. 4.).¶##VI. ¶Quoad conclusionem:¶ cfr. Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 43. m. 4, et q. 46. m. 5. ¶¶ Scot., hic q. unic.; et Report. hic q. 1.¶ ¶¶ S. Thom., hic q. 1. a. 1; S. I. q. 36. a. 2; S. c. Gent. IV c. 24. 25; Opusc. 6. contra Errores Graecorum.¶ ¶¶ B. Albert., hic a. 6; S. p. I. tr. 7. q. 31. m. 1. 2. ¶¶¶ Petr. a Tar., hic q. 1. a. 1.¶ ¶¶ Richard. a Med., hic a. 1. 2. ¶¶¶ Aegid. R., hic 1. princ. q. 1.¶ ¶¶ Henr. Gand., S. a. 54. q. 6. ¶¶¶ Durand., hic q. 1. ¶¶¶ Dionys. Carth., hic q. 1.¶ ¶¶ Biel, hic q. 1. 2.¶VI. ¶As regards the conclusion:¶ cf. Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I, q.

43, m. 4, and q. 46, m. 5. (Bl. John Duns) Scotus, here in q. sole; and in Reportatio., here in q. 1. (Bl. St. Thomas, here in q. 1, a. 1; Summa., I, q. 36, a. 2; Summa contra Gentiles., IV, c. 24 and 25; Opuscle. 6. Against the Errors of the Greeks. (Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 6; Summa., p. I, tr. 7, q. 31, m. 1 and 2. (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 1, a. 1. Richard of Middletown, here in a. 1 and 2. Giles the Roman, here in 1. princ., q. 1. Henry of Ghent, Summa., a. 54, q. 6. Durandus, here in q. 1. (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, here in q. 1. (Gabriel) Biel, here in q. 1 and 2.####The English translation here has been released to the public domain by its author. The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quaracchi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation than that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [ ] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator. Items in round ( ) brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.

S. Bonaventurae  
Bagnoregis#S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae#atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis#St.  
Bonaventure of Bagnoregio#Cardinal Bishop of Alba#& Doctor of the  
Church##Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum#Commentaries on the Four  
Books of Sentences##Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis#of Master Peter  
Lombard, Archbishop of Paris##PRIMI LIBRI#BOOK ONE##COMMENTARIUS IN  
DISTINCTIONEM XI.#COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XI##ARTICULUS UNICUS#Quaestio  
II.#ARTICLE SOLE#Question 2##Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,#Ad Claras Aquas,  
1882, Vol 1, pp. 214-217.#Cum Notitiis Originalibus#Latin text taken from  
Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,#Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 214-217.#Notes  
by the Quaracchi Editors.##QUAESTIO II.#Utrum Spiritus sanctus procedat a  
Patre et Filio tamquam ab uno principio.#QUESTION 2#Whether the Holy Spirit  
proceeds from the Father and the Son as from one principle.##Secundo quaeritur,  
utrum Spiritus sanctus procedat a Patre et Filio, in quantum sunt unum, aut in  
quantum differentes.#Second there is asked, whether the Holy Spirit proceeds  
from the Father and the Son, inasmuch as They are One, or inasmuch as (They  
are) different.##1. Et quod in quantum unum, videtur per Anselmum in libro de  
Processione Spiritus sancti:1#Nullus intellectus capit, Spiritum sanctum esse  
Patris et Filii, secundum quod alter est Pater, alter Filius, sed secundum quod  
uterque est idem Deus #1. And that (He is) inasmuch as (They are) one, seems  
through (St.) Anselm (of Canterbury) in (his) book On the Procession of the Holy  
Spirit1 (where he says):#No intellect grasps, that the Holy Spirit is of the  
Father and of the Son, according to which one is the Father, another the Son,  
but according to which Each is the same God #.##2. Item, ratione ostenditur  
sic:#unitas effectus est ab unitate actus, et unitas actus ab unitate potentiae  
vel subiecti; ergo cum una sit persona producta a Patre et Filio, ergo per unum  
actum producitur et per unam potentiam: ergo spirant, in quantum sunt unum.#2.  
Likewise, by reason it is shown thus:#a unity of effecting is from a unity of  
acting, and a unity of acting is from a unity of power [potentiae] and/or of  
subject; therefore since One is the Person produced from the Father and the Son,  
therefore He produces through one act and through one power: therefore They  
spirate, inasmuch as They are One.##3. Item, quod est a duobus, in quantum duo,  
aut est insufficiens a quolibet, aut ab altero superflue; sed Spiritus sanctus  
a nulla persona est insufficiens nec superflue, quia neutrum convenit naturae  
perfectae: ergo etc.#3. Likewise, that which is from two, inasmuch as (it is)  
two, either is insufficiently from any one, or superfluously from one of the  
two:#but the Holy Spirit is insufficiently nor superfluously from no Person,  
because neither (manner) befits a perfect nature: ergo etc..##4. Item, quod est  
a duobus in quantum duo, est compositum, si consubstantialiter est ab illis;  
ergo . . .#4. Likewise, that which is from two inasmuch as (they are) two, is a  
composite (being), if it is from them consubstantially;2 therefore . . .##1  
Cap. 21:#Nullus sensus capit, Spiritum sanctum esse Spiritum Patris aut Filii .  
. . . uterque unus idemque Deus est.2#Plurimi codd. cum ed. 1 consubstantialiter  
loco substantialiter. In proxime sequenti propositione exhibemus lectionem, . .  
.#1#Chapter 21:#No sense grasps, that the Holy Spirit is of the Father or of  
the Son . . . and each is the one and same God.2#Very many codices together



with edition 1 have consubstantially in place of substantially. In the following, next sentence, we exhibit the reading . . . .p. 215 si a duobus in quantum duo procedit unus, oportet quod illud unum habeat differentiam; sed Spiritus sanctus non est compositus: ergo etc. #if from two, inasmuch as two, there proceeds one person [unus], it is opportune that that one individual [unum] have a difference; but the Holy Spirit is not a composite: ergo etc. ##5. Item, nihil unum procedit a duobus consimilibus<sup>1</sup> in natura in quantum duo, nisi alter sit sicut principium activum, alter sicut principium passivum, sive alter ut pater, alter ut mater; sed hoc non est in divinis: ergo etc. #5. Likewise, nothing proceeds as one from two completely similar<sup>1</sup> in nature inasmuch as (they are) two, except the one be as an active principle, the other as a passive principle, or the one as a father, the other as a mother, but this is not among the divine: ergo etc. ##CONTRA: 1. Qui procedit a duobus, ita quod ab uno principaliter quam ab alio, procedit<sup>2</sup> in quantum sunt duo; sed Spiritus sanctus principaliter procedit a Patre, sicut dicit Augustinus et habetur in sequenti distinctione: <sup>3</sup> ergo etc. #ON THE CONTRARY: 1. He who proceeds from two, such that (his is) from one more principally than from the other, proceeds<sup>2</sup> inasmuch as they are two; but the Holy Spirit principally proceeds from the Father, just as (St.) Augustine says and as is had in the following distinction: <sup>3</sup> ergo etc. ##2. Item, qui procedit a duobus in quantum sunt distincti, procedit a duobus in quantum sunt duo; sed nexus non est nisi distinctorum: ergo qui procedit ut nexus, procedit ab eis ut a distinctis, et ita ut a differentibus. #2. Likewise, he who proceeds from two, inasmuch as they are distinct, proceeds from two, inasmuch as they are two; but a nexus is not but of (things) distinct: therefore He who proceeds as a nexus, proceeds from Them as from distinct (Persons), and thus as from different ones. ##3. Item, ab unitate subiecti est unitas actus, et a pluralitate subiectorum pluralitas actuum;<sup>4</sup> sed Pater et Filius sunt duo: ergo spirant duplici spiratione: ergo spiratur Spiritus sanctus ab eis, in quantum sunt duo: ergo etc. #3. Likewise, from the unity of a subject is the unity of (its) acting [actus], and from the plurality of subjects a plurality of actings;<sup>4</sup> but the Father and the Son are two: therefore They spirate by a twofold spiration: therefore the Holy Spirit is spirated by Them, inasmuch as They are two: ergo etc. ##4. Item, si spirant Spiritum sanctum in quantum sunt unum, aut<sup>5</sup> in quantum sunt unum in substantia, aut in notione, aut in persona. Si in quantum sunt unum in substantia: ergo cum Spiritus sanctus sit idem in substantia, Spiritus sanctus procedit a se. Si in quantum sunt idem in notione; hoc nihil est, quia non ideo spirant, quia sunt spiratores, sed e converso. Nec in quantum sunt unum in persona, quia in persona non uniuntur. #4. Likewise, if They spirate the Holy Spirit, inasmuch as They are one, either<sup>5</sup> inasmuch as They are one in substance, or in notion, or in person. If inasmuch as They are one in substance: therefore since the Holy Spirit is the Same in Substance, the Holy Spirit proceeds from Himself. If inasmuch as They are the same in notion; this is nothing, because They do not for that reason spirate, because They are spirators, but the other way around. Nor inasmuch as They are one in person, because in person They are not united. ##CONCLUSIO. Spiritus sanctus procedit a Patre et a Filio, non quatenus sunt distinctae personae, sed quatenus in eis est una fecunditas voluntatis sive una spiratio activa. #CONCLUSION. The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and from the Son, not to the extent that They are distinct Persons, but to the extent that in Them there is one Fecundity of Will or one active Spiration. ##RESPONDEO: Dicendum, quod Spiritus sanctus procedit a Patre et Filio, in quantum sunt unum in fecunditate voluntatis. Una autem est in Patre et Filio voluntas, quia Pater et Filius sunt una substantia; si ergo est in eis voluntatis fecunditas, una est fecunditas in eis. Voluntatis autem fecunditas est in Patre et in Filio, quia uterque<sup>6</sup> Deus improcessibilis. Sicut enim superius dictum fuit de numero personarum<sup>7</sup> et infra melius patebit,<sup>8</sup> cum agetur de innascibilitate, quae idem est in Patre quod primitas; cum primum et principium sint idem;<sup>9</sup> ratio primitatis est ratio principiandi, sive fecunditatis. Quoniam igitur Pater prior est omni emanatione, scilicet processione et generatione, quia nec generatur nec procedit, hinc est, quod utroque modo est principium. Quia vero Filius prior est emanatione processionis, non generationis quia generatur, tamen est inspirabilis hinc

est, quod est principium spirandi, non generandi. ¶ Quia vero Spiritus sanctus neutro modo se habet, neutro modo est principium. ¶ Inde est igitur, quod quamvis Spiritus sanctus a duobus procedat, ¶ quia tamen procedit non ut sunt differentes, sed ut est in eis una fecunditas voluntatis, quod<sup>10</sup> Spiritus sanctus procedit ab eis, in quantum sunt unum. #I RESPOND: ¶ It must be said, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, inasmuch as They are one in the fecundity of Will. ¶ Moreover, there is in the Father and the Son one Will, because the Father and the Son are one Substance; if, therefore, there is in Them a fecundity of Will, there is one fecundity in Them. ¶ Moreover there is a fecundity of the Will in the Father and the Son, because Each (is)<sup>6</sup> the improcessible God. ¶ For just as had been said above concerning the number of Persons<sup>7</sup> and (as) shall be more clear below,<sup>8</sup> when (their) innascibility is dealt with, which is the same (thing) in the Father as (His) primacy; since the first and the beginning [principium] are the same;<sup>9</sup> the reckoning of primacy is the reckoning of beginning, or of fecundity. ¶ Therefore, since the Father is prior to every emanation, that is, to procession and generation, because He is neither generated nor proceeds, hence it is, that in each manner He is the principle [principium]. ¶ On the other hand, because the Son is prior to the Emanation of the Procession, not of the Generation ¶ because He is generated, yet He is unspiratable ¶ hence it is, that He is a principle of spirating, not of generating. ¶ On the other hand, because the Holy Spirit is regarded in neither manner, He is a principle in neither manner. ¶ Hence it is, therefore, that although the Holy Spirit proceeds from Two, because, however, He proceeds, not because [ut] They are different, but because [ut] there is in Them one fecundity of Will, that<sup>10</sup> the Holy Spirit proceeds from Them, inasmuch as They are one.##1. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod principaliter . . .#1. To that which is objected, that principally . . .###quae in pluribus tantum codicibus ut A H P Q W etc. invenitur. ¶ Maior quidem pars codd. cum ed. 1 legit procedit unus loco procedit unum, quod habet Vat., sed in reliquis convenit cum Vat. ponendo quia loco ergo si et praemittendo particulas et ita verbo oportet. ¶ Inspecienti tamen patet, in hac propositione non contineri rationem maioris, etiamsi cum cod. T legatur quia a duobus in quantum duo non procedit unus; unde in ipsa continetur applicatio maioris ad aliquod speciale, quod et satis clare indicatur per terminum unus, scil. persona Spiritus sancti, quae tanquam quid unum habere deberet in se compositionem seu differentiam. ¶ Aliqui codd. u H M bb ee bene post habeat addunt in se.<sup>10</sup> Ex mss. et ed. 1 substituimus consimilibus pro similibus.<sup>20</sup> In cod. O additur ab eis.<sup>30</sup> Vide ibid. lit. Magisteri, c. 2. et q. 2.<sup>40</sup> Supplevimus ex cod. T et a pluralitate subiectorum pluralitas actuum, quia et contextus ea verba requirit, et in principio solutionis huius obiectionis ipsa explicite recitantur. ¶ Ratio haec fundatur in illo axioma: actus sunt suppositorum; ergo duorum suppositorum non est unica actio.<sup>50</sup> Cod. W non male addit ergo.<sup>60</sup> Cod. Y addit est; cod. Z vero habet est loco Deus.<sup>70</sup> Dist. 2. q. 2. et 4.<sup>80</sup> Dist. 28. per totam.<sup>90</sup> Aristot., I. Poster. c. 2: ¶ Idem enim dico primum et principium. ¶ Vat., variata constructione, prater fidem mss. et ed. 1 et primum et principium sunt idem, et ratio, sed minus distincte, quae et paulo infra cum cod. cc, antiquioribus autem codd. et ed. 1 refragantibus, post prior est perperam adiungit in.<sup>100</sup> Auctoritate plurimorum mss. expunximus patet, quod Vat. minus apte praefigit verbo quod; ed. 1 loco patet habet hinc est. ¶ Consentit Augustinus, V. de Trin. c. 14. n. 15: ¶ Si ergo et quod datur principium habet eum a quo datur . . . fatendum est, Patrem et Filium principium esse Spiritus sancti, non duo principia; sed sicut Pater et Filius unus Deus, et ad creaturam relative unus Creator et unus Dominus, sic relative ad Spiritus sanctum unum principium etc.###which is found only in very many codices, such as A H P Q W etc.. ¶ Indeed the greater part of the codices together with edition 1 read there proceeds one (person) [unus] in place of there proceeds one (individual) [unum], which the Vatican edition has, but in the rest the sentence agrees with the Vatican edition, by putting because [quia] in place of therefore [ergo] and by prefacing the particles and thus [et ita] to it is opportune [oportet]. ¶ It is clear to whoever looks into the manner, that in this proposition the reckoning of the major is not contained; even if together with codex T there is read that from two, inasmuch as (They are) two, there proceeds one (person) [quia a duobus in quantum duo no procedit unus]; whence in this

there is contained an application of the major to something special, which also is indicated sufficiently clearly through the term one (person) [unus], that is, the Person of the Holy Spirit, who as a certain one individual [unum] ought to have in Himself a composition or difference. ¶ Some codices, such as H M bb and ee, after have [habeat] read in Himself [in se].10 ¶ From the manuscripts and edition 1, we have substituted completely similar [consimilibus] for similar [similibus].20 ¶ In codex O there is added from them [ab eis].30 ¶ See the text of Master (Peter), ch. 2, and (also here at) q. 2.40 ¶ We have supplied from codex T and from the plurality of subjects a plurality of actings [et a pluralitate subiectorum pluralitas actuum], because the context also requires those words, and at the beginning of the solution of this objection they are explicitly cited. ¶¶¶ This reckoning is founded in that axiom: ¶ Acts [actus] are of suppositis; therefore of two suppositis there is not a unique action [actio].¶50 ¶ Codex W non male addit therefore [ergo].60 ¶ Codex Y adds the is [est]; but codex Z has Each is improcessible [uterque est improcessibilis] in place of Each (is) the improcesible God [uterque Deus improcessibilis].70 ¶ Distinction 2, q. 2 and 4.80 ¶ Distinction 28, throughout.90 ¶ Aristotle, Posterior Analytics, Bk. I, ch. 2: ¶ For I say that ¶ the first ¶ and ¶ the beginning ¶ are the same. ¶¶¶ The Vatican edition, having varied the construction, not trusting in the manuscripts and in edition 1, has both the first and the beginning are the same, and the reckoning [et primum et principium sunt idem, et ratio] but less distinctly, which edition also a little below, together with codex cc, but against the more ancient codices and edition 1, has is prior in [prior est in] in place of is prior to [prior est].100 ¶ On the authority of very many manuscripts, we have expunged the it is clear [patet], which the Vatican edition lessaptly prefixes to the word that [quod]; edition 1 in place of it is clear [patet] has hence it is [hinc est]. ¶¶¶ (St.) Augustine agrees, in On the Trinity, Bk. V, ch. 14, n. 15: ¶ If, therefore, even that which is given a beginning [principium] has that from which it is given . . . it must be admitted, that the Father and the Son are the principle [principium] of the Holy Spirit, not two principles; but just as the Father and the Son (are) the One God, and, relatively to the creature, the One Creator and the One Lord, so relatively to the Holy Spirit one principle etc.. ¶### ¶ Op. 216 ¶ procedit a Patre; dicendum, quod principaliter potest dici dupliciter: ¶ aut respectu secundarii, et sic importat ordinem prioris et posteriors, et sic ponit diversitatem, et hoc modo non accipitur hic; alio modo prout principalitas dicit quandam auctoritatem, sicut Pater dicitur operari per Filium. ¶ Unde unaquaeque creatura producitur a Patre per Filium, in quantum sunt unum; et sic intelligendum est in proposito. ¶ He proceeds from the Father; it must be said, that ¶ principally ¶ can be said in a twofold manner: ¶ either in respect to something following [secundarii], and thus it conveys the order of prior and posterior, and thus it posits a diversity, and in this manner it is not accepted here; in another manner insofar as ¶ principality ¶ means a certain authority, just as the Father is said to work through the Son. ¶ Whence each single [unaquaeque]1 creature is produced by the Father through the Son, inasmuch as They are one; and thus is it to be understood in the proposed.¶#2. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod nexus procedit a pluribus etc.; dicendum, quod ratio nexus incipit a distinctione et tendit sive perducit2 in unitatem: ¶ unde ultima et completiva ratio est unitas. ¶ Licet ergo nexus sit duorum et a duobus, si est perfectus nexus, est ab eis in quantum sunt unum, non in quantum sunt plures.3#2. To that which is objected, that a nexus proceeds from very many etc.; it must be said, that the reckoning of a nexus begins from a distinction and tends or leads thoroughly [perducit]2 into a unity: ¶ whence the ultimate and completing reckoning is unity. ¶ Therefore, though a nexus be of two and from two, if it is a perfect nexus, it is from them inasmuch as they are one, not inasmuch as they are more.3##3. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod ab unitate subiecti est unitas actus et a pluralitate pluralitas; dicendum, quod istud non habet instantiam secundum modum loquendi, quia si duo sunt termini copulati, actus numeratus debet eis4 reddi; sed secundum rem distinguendum est, quia subiectum dicitur dupliciter: aut per se et primo, aut non primo; et illud verum est de subiecto per se et primo, non de alio; et sic accipiendo, Pater et Filius non sunt unum principium, seu5 primum subiectum spirationis, quia non spirant secundum quod Pater et Filius, sed secundum quod in eis est una fecunditas

voluntatis, et ita in quantum unum. ¶¶¶ Vel aliter dicendum, quod est loqui de actu, ut est actus vel6 origo, et de actu, ut est accidens. ¶Si loquimur de actu, ut est accidens, de necessitate numeratur ad numerum subiecti, quia non est unum accidens in duobus subiectis. ¶Si autem loquamur de actu, ut est actus,7 sic comparatur ad subiectum ut ad principium, et sic non numeratur ad numerum subiecti secundum quod subiectum, sed secundum quod principium. ¶Quoniam igitur in divinis spiratio non est accidens, sed productio vel relatio; ideo sequitur unitatem subiecti, ut est principium, quia8 Pater et Filius, quamvis duae sint personae, tamen sunt principium unum, quia per eandem virtutem spirant:¶ ideo actus non numeratur in illis, ideo spirant una spiratione, quamvis sint duo.¶3. To that which is objected, that from a unity of subject there is a unity of acting and from a plurality a plurality; it must be said, that that (argument) is not pertinent [non habet instantiam] according to the manner of speaking, because if there are two termini conjoined, their act ought to reckoned [reddi] as numbered;4 but according to the thing [rem] it must be distinguished, because ¶subject¶ is said in a twofold manner: either through itself and the first, or not through the first; and that is true concerning (what is) a subject through itself and the first, not concerning an other; and by accepting (it) in this manner, the Father and the Son are not one principle, or5 the first subject of the Spiration, because They do not spirate according to which (They are) Father and Son, but according to which there is in Them one fecundity of Will, and thus inasmuch as (They are) one. ¶¶¶ And/or in another way it must be said, that there is a speaking concerning acting, as it is an act and/or6 origin, and concerning act, as it is an accident. ¶If we speak of an act, as it is an accident, of necessity one counts according to the number of the subject, because there is not one accident in two subjects. ¶But if we speak of an act, as it is an act,7 in this manner it is compared to a subject as to a principle, and thus it is not counted according to the number of the subject according to which (it is) a subject, but according to which (it is) a principle. ¶Therefore, since among the divine Spiration is not an accident, because8 the Father and the Son, although They are two Persons, yet They are one Principle, because They spirate through the same virtue:¶ for that reason act is not enumerated in Them, for that reason They spirate by one Spiration, although They are two (Persons).¶¶4. Ad illud quod quaeritur ultimo, aut in quantum unum in substantia etc.; dicendum, quod in quantum unum in fecunditate voluntatis, prout illa voluntas tracta est ad notionem per fecunditatem, quae fecunditas est ratione primitatis, quae primitas significatur per hoc quod est improcessibilis. ¶Et hoc est quod dicit Anselmus, quod Pater et Filius spirant, secundum quod uterque est idem Deus, non secundum quod Deus simpliciter, sed secundum quod Deus in utroque; hoc est considerare voluntatem in personis.¶4. To that which is asked last, either inasmuch as (They are) one in substance etc.; it must be said, that inasmuch as (They are) one in the fecundity of the Will, insofar as that Will is treated as being known through (its) fecundity, which fecundity is by the reckoning of primacy, which primacy is signified through that which is improcessible. ¶And this is what (St.) Anselm says, that the Father and the Son spirate, according to which Each is the same God, not according to which (They are) God simply, but according to which God (is) in Each; that is to consider the Will in the Persons.¶¶Si ergo quaeras, utrum in quantum unum in substantia, aut notione, aut persona; dicendum, quod responderi potest dupliciter, secundum duas opiniones prius positas de potentia generandi, distinctione septima;9 quod quidam dicunt, quod potentia generandi non differt a generatione sive paternitate nisi modo loquendi, et ita dicit notionem, scilicet personalem proprietatem, ut generatio, licet alio modo. ¶Similiter isti dicunt, quod fecunditas voluntatis sive vis spirativa dicit eandem notionem, quam spiratio, licet alio modo, quia vis spirativa dicit ut in ratione aptitudinis, sed spiratio10 in ratione actus; et ita secundum hos in quantum sunt unum notione. ¶Alii dicunt, quod sicut potentia generandi dicit naturam in persona, ita essentiam personaliter, sic vis spirativa voluntatem dicit, ut voluntas est in personis, in quibus est fecunda;11 et ita Pater et Filii spirant in quantum unum in essentia sive natura sive voluntate, ut dicatur proprius,12 voluntate considerata in personis. ¶Quaelibet harum positionum mihi videtur satis probabilis.¶If, therefore, you ask, whether (He proceeds) inasmuch as (They are)

one in substance, or notion, or person; it must be said, that one can respond in a twofold manner, according to the two opinions previously posited concerning the power of generating, in the seventh distinction;<sup>9</sup> because some say, that the power of generating does not differ from generation or paternity except by a manner of speaking, and thus it means a notion, that is a personal property, such as *generation*, though in another manner. Similarly these say, that *fecundity of the will* or *spirative force* means the same notion, that spiration (does), though in another manner, because one says *spirative force* in the reckoning of aptitude, but spiration<sup>10</sup> in the reckoning of the act; and thus, according to these, inasmuch as they are one in notion. Others say, that just as the power of generating means the nature in the person, so (also) the essence (reckoned) personally, so *spirative force* means *the will*, because [ut] the Will is in the Persons, in whom It is fecund;<sup>11</sup> and thus the Father and the Son spirate inasmuch as (They are) one in Essence or Nature or Will, as may be said more properly,<sup>12</sup> in the Will considered in the Persons. Each of these positions seems to me sufficiently probable. ###SCHOLIUM.##I. Pro intelligentia huius quaestionis notandum, quod Pater et Filius conveniunt in aliqua re notionali scil. spiratione activa, in qua Spiritus sanctus non convenit cum eis; unde ipsa ad relationem aliquo modo spectare debet, cum constet, in essentia tres personas omnino convenire. Ad eandem quaestionem accuratius explicandum S. Doctor redit infra d. 29. a. 2. q. 1. 2. #I. For an understanding of this question it must be noted, that the Father and the Son convene in some notional category [re], that is, in active spiration, in which the Holy Spirit does not convene with Them; whence that ought to look to the relation in some manner, since it is established, that the Three Persons entirely convene in the Essence. For a more accurate explanation of the same question, refer to what the Seraphic Doctor says below in d. 29, a. 2, qq. 1 and 2. ##II. In solut. ad 4. recurrit S. Doctor ad ea quae supra d. . . . #II. In the solution to n. 4, the Seraphic Doctor returns to that which he said above . . . ##10 Praeferimus lectionem plurimum mss. ut F G H P Q unaquaeque loco una.<sup>20</sup> Ita plures codd. ut A D E G H I P Q R T etc. Vat. procedit, sed minus bene; alii cum ed. 1 falso produxit.<sup>30</sup> Mox cod. Z post ratio addit eius.<sup>30</sup> Vide. d. 10. a. 2. q. 2. ad 3.<sup>40</sup> Richard. a Med., hic q. 3. eandem objectionem ita solvit:<sup>50</sup> Dico, quod istud argumentum non plus concludit, nisi quod procedit a pluribus; et hoc est verum. Ab eis tamen procedit in quantum in potentia spirativa sunt unum.<sup>40</sup> Vat. ei loco eis, castigatur ope plurimorum mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3, loco cuius cod. X habet sic.<sup>50</sup> Exemplum accipe in hoc:<sup>60</sup> Petrus et Paulus currunt; ubi actus currendi redditur in plurali utrique subiecto.<sup>50</sup> Codd. inter se non conveniunt; multi cum ed. 1 omittunt seu; cod. T omittit principium seu, cod. H principium seu primum; codd. G Z substituunt unum pro seu.<sup>60</sup> Ed. 1 sive. <sup>70</sup> Vat. prater fidem mss. et ed. 1 addit vel origo.<sup>80</sup> Vat., fere omnibus antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 reluctantibus, quare; cod. I et quia.<sup>90</sup> Quaest. 10 <sup>100</sup> Fide mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3, 6 supplevimus verba distinctione septima; quod quidam dicunt, quod loco quorum Vat. quia ipsa, quae et paulo infra, post nisi, multis mss. ut A F G I P Q S T V W X etc. obnitentibus, addit in.<sup>100</sup> Cod. V repetit hic ut.<sup>110</sup> Aliqui codd. ut H I Z fecunditas.<sup>120</sup> Pauci codd. ut F M X perperam

prius. Mox ex antiquis mss. et ed. 1 substituimus harum loco illarum. ##10 We prefer the reading of very many manuscripts, such as F G H P Q, each single [unaquaeque] in place of one [una].<sup>20</sup> Thus very many codices, such as A D E G H I P Q R T etc. The Vatican edition has proceeds [procedit], but less well; the others with edition 1 falsely read produced [produxit]. Then codex Z by adding its [eius] reads its ultimate and complete etc..<sup>30</sup> See d. 10, a. 2, q. 2, ad 3.<sup>40</sup> Richard of Middletown, here in q. 3 solves the same objection thus:<sup>50</sup> I say, that that argument does conclude for *not more*, except because He proceeds from more, and this is true. From Them, however, He proceeds inasmuch as They are one in spirative potency.<sup>40</sup> The Vatican edition<sup>s</sup> to it [ei] in place of to them [eis], is corrected with the assistance of very many manuscripts and editions 1, 2 and 3, in which place codex X has in this manner [sic]. An example of this, of which the Seraphic Doctor speaks, is this:<sup>50</sup> Peter and Paul run; where the act of running is reckoned in the plural by the subject of each.<sup>50</sup> The codices do not agree among themselves; many, with edition 1, omit or [seu]; codex T omits

principle, or [principium, seu]; codices G and Z substitute one [unum] for or [seu].<sup>60</sup> Edition 1 reads or [sive].<sup>70</sup> The Vatican edition, not trusting in the manuscripts and edition 1, adds and/or origin [vel origo].<sup>80</sup> The Vatican edition, striving against nearly all the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, has why [quare]; codex I has and because [et quia].<sup>90</sup> Question 1.<sup>00</sup> Trusting the manuscripts and editions 1, 2, 3 and 6 we have supplied the words in the seventh distinction; because some say, that [distinctione septima; quod quidam dicunt, quod], in place those of the Vatican edition because it [quia ipsa], which edition a little below, after except [nisi], disagreeing with many manuscripts, such as A F G I P Q S T V W X etc., has in a manner of speaking [in modo loquendi] in place of by a manner of speaking [modo loquendi].<sup>10</sup> Codex V repeats here a such as [ut].<sup>110</sup> Some codices, such as H I and Z, have in whom there is fecundity [in quibus est fecunditas].<sup>120</sup> A few codices, such as F M and X, faultily read before [prius] for more properly [proprius].<sup>0</sup> Then from the ancient manuscript and edition 1, we have substituted of these [harum] for of those [illarum].###Op. 217<sup>07</sup>. q. 1. de duplici opinione circa potentiam generandi dixit; cfr. ibi Scholion, et infra d. 27. p. I. q. 2, et d. 28. per totam. <sup>0</sup>Sibi constans Seraphicus, qui ibi utramque opinionem probabilem declaravit, etiam hoc loco secundum utramque positionem respondit.#in d. 7, q. 1, concerning the twofold opinion about the power of generating, cfr. there the Scholium, and below in d. 27, p. I, q. 2, and d. 28 throughout. <sup>0</sup>For his part the Seraphic Doctor declares, there, that each opinion is probable, even though in this passage He responds according to the second position.###III. Conclusio est, quod Pater et Filius producant Spiritum sanctum, quatenus sunt unum in fecunditate voluntatis. <sup>0</sup>Evidens enim est, quod non possint spirare, quatenus sunt unum in essentia, quia in essentia etiam cum Spiritu sancto unum sunt, quoad personam vero sunt duo, non unum; ergo producant Spiritum sanctum, quatenus sunt unum in notione i. e. in spratione activa.###III.<sup>0</sup> The conclusion is, that the Father and the Son produce the Holy Spirit, to the extent that They are one in the fecundity of the Will. <sup>0</sup>For it is evident, that They could not spirate, to the extent that They are one in Essence, because They are also one in Essence with the Holy Spirit, however as regards Person, they are Two, not One; therefore They produce the Holy Spirit, to the extent that They are one in notion, i. e., in active spiration.###IV. Cfr. infra d. 29. a. 2. q. 1. 2. <sup>000</sup> Alex. Hal., S. p. I., q. 70. m. 3. a. 3. seqq.<sup>00</sup> Scot., I. Sent. d. 12. q. 1: et Report. d. 12. q. 1. 2.<sup>00</sup> S. Thom., hic q. 1. a. 2. seqq; S. I. q. 36. a. 4; S. c. Gent. IV. c. 25. <sup>000</sup> B. Albert., hic a. 3. 4. 5; S. p. I. tr. 7. q. 31. m. 3. q. 1. incident.<sup>00</sup> Petr. a Tar., hic q. 1. a. 2. seqq.<sup>00</sup> Richard. a. Med., hic q. 3. seqq.<sup>00</sup> Aegid. R., hic 2. princ. q. 1 et 2.<sup>00</sup> Henr. Gand., S. a. 54. q. 6. n. 50. seqq.<sup>00</sup> Durand., hic q. 3. <sup>000</sup> Dionys. Carth., hic q. 3. 4.<sup>00</sup> Biel, I. Sent. d. 12. q. 1. 2.###IV. Cf. below d. 29, a. 2, q. 1 and 2. <sup>000</sup> Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I., q. 70, m. 3, a. 3 ff.<sup>00</sup> (Bl. John Duns) Scotus, Sent., Bk. I, d. 12, q. 1: and Reportatio., d. 12, q. 1 and 2.<sup>00</sup> St. Thomas, here in q. 1, a. 2 ff; Summa., I, q. 36, a. 4; Summa contra Gentiles., IV, c. 25. <sup>000</sup> Bl. (now St.) Albertus Magnus, here in aa. 3, 4, 5; Summa., p. I, tr. 7, q. 31, m. 3, q. 1. in passing.<sup>00</sup> (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 1. a. 2 ff.<sup>00</sup> Richard of Middleton, here in q. 3 ff.<sup>00</sup> Giles the Roman, here in 2. princ., q. 1 and 2.<sup>00</sup> Henry of Ghent, Summa., a. 54, q. 6, n. 50 ff.<sup>00</sup> Durandus, here in q. 3. <sup>000</sup> (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, here q. 3 and 4.<sup>00</sup> (Gabriel) Biel, Sent., Bk. I, d. 12, q. 1 and 2.####The English translation here has been released to the public domain by its author. The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quaracchi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation than that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [ ] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator. Items in round ( ) brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis#S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae#atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis#St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio#Cardinal Bishop of Alba#& Doctor of the Church##Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum#Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences##Magistri Petri

Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis#of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris##PRIMI LIBRI#BOOK ONE##COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XI.#COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XI##DUBIA CIRCA LITTERAM MAGISTRI.#DOUBTS ON THE TEXT OF MASTER PETER###Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,#Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 217-218.#Cum Notitiis Originalibus##Latin text taken from Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,#Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 217-218.#Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.###DUB. I.#DOUBT I##In ista parte sunt dubitationes circa litteram et primo de hoc quod dicit: In principalibus Conciliis, quae apud eos celebrata sunt. Quaeritur ergo, quae sunt illa quatuor principalia Concilia?#In this part there are doubts about the text (of Master Peter) and first concerning this which he says. In the principle councils, which were celebrated amongst them. Therefore it is asked, which are those four principle councils?##RESPONDEO: Et dicendum, quod fuerunt quatuor principalia Concilia Apostolorum in Ecclesia primitiva, ut dicit quaedam Glossa super Actus.2 Primum fuit ad electionem Matthiae, Actuum primo;3 secundum ad electionem septem diaconorum, Actuum sexto;4 tertium fuit ad non imponenda legalia gentibus, Actuum decimo quinto;5 quartum ad tolerandum legalia ad tempus, Actuum vigesimo primo.6#I RESPOND: And it must be said, that there were four principle Councils of the Apostles in the primitive Church, as a certain Gloss on Acts says.2 The First was at the election of (St.) Matthias, Acts (chapter) one;3 the second at the election of the seven deacons, Acts (chapter) six;4 the third was for not imposing the observances of the Law [legalia] upon the Gentiles, Acts (chapter) fifteen;5 the fourth to tolerate the observances of the Law for a time, Acts (chapter) twenty-one.6##Concilia vero Patrum principalia apud Graecos similiter fuerunt quatuor, scilicet Nicaenum, Ephesinum, Chalcedonense et Constantinopolitanum.#However, the principle Councils of the Fathers, among the Greeks, were similarly four, that is, Nicea, Ephesus, Chalcedon and Constantinople.##DUB. II.#DOUBT II##Item quaeritur de expositione illa, quam ponit Magister super illud: Qui aliud docuerit vel aliter praedicaverit etc.; et exponit: id est, contrarium docuerit vel contrario modo etc.; quia non videtur ista expositio probabilis, eo quod ille qui contradicit articulis, excommunicatus est ipso iure: ergo non oportebat pro contrario dare sententiam: ergo videtur, quod pro diverso tulerunt sententiam. Praeterea, unde venit ista expositio? Pro Deo!7 quare non dixerunt: quisquis contradixerit?#Likewise is asked concerning that exposition, which Master (Peter) puts on that (passage): He who has taught something else and/or preached in another manner etc.; and he expounds (it thus): that is, has taught the contrary and/or preached in a contrary manner etc.; because that exposition of his does not seem probable, for the reason that he who contradicts the articles, has been excommunicated by the law itself [ipso iure]: therefore it was not opportune to put forth [dare] a sentence on behalf of the contrary: therefore it seems, that (the Fathers of the Council) excluded [tulerunt] a sentence on behalf of a diverse (opinion). Moreover, whence comes that exposition of his? For God's sake!7 why did they not say whosoever has contradicted?##RESPONDEO: Dicendum, quod sicut dicit Anselmus:8 Omnis veritas sacrae Scripturae potest dici, quae sacrae Scripturae non contradicit, propter suam generalitatem et dignitatem; et ideo praedicta expositio habet hic locum. Nec fuit inconveniens exprimere excommunicationem haereticorum, quia sancti Patres in conciliis ordinabant quae iuris erant, et propterea9 ad terrorem est dictum; et maluerunt dicere aliud, quamvis intellexerint contrarium, ut magis compescerent ora praesumptuosorum, ne adinvenirent novitates in fide. Secundum veritatem autem excommunicationis sententia non se extendit nisi ad contradicentes; quia non fuit eorum intentio, praeccludendi viam ad explicationem fidei faciendam maiorem, si Deus alios magis illuminaret; et si hoc dixissent, constat quod non bene moti fuissent, et sententia eorum merito abolenda esset.10#I RESPOND: It must be said, that just as (St.) Anselm says:8 Every truth can be said of Sacred Scripture, which does not contradict Sacred Scripture, on account of its generality and dignity; and for that reason the aforesaid exposition has (its) place here. Nor was it unfitting to express the excommunication of heretics, because the holy Fathers used to ordain in the Councils what belonged to the law, and on this account9 it has been said to frighten [ad terrorem]; and they preferred to say something else [aliud], though they understood the contrary, to shut-up [compescerent] more the mouths of the

presumptuous, lest they invent novelties in the faith. But, in its truest sense [secundum veritatem] the sentence of excommunication does not extend itself except to those contradicting (the dogma); because it was not their intention, to preclude the way to make a greater explanation of the faith, if God would illumine others more; and if they had said this, it is established that they would not have been well moved, and rightly [merito] their sentence would have to be abolished.10##DUB. III.#DOUBT III##Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit, quod non est aliud Spiritum sanctum esse Filii quam esse a Filio. Sed contra: aliud est dicere cappa Socratis quam cappa facta a Socrate: ergo similiter videtur in proposito; aut si non, quaeritur ratio.11#Likewise is asked concerning this which he says, that that the Holy Spirit is of the Son is not other than that He is from the Son. But on the contrary: it is something else to say the hat of Socrates than the hat made by Socrates: therefore similarly it seems in the proposed; or if not, the reason is asked.11##Et dicendum, quod genitivus, quamvis denominetur ab habitudine principii, tamen aliam habitudinem importat, immo alias,12 ut possessionis; sed cum in divinis non cadat diversitas nec habitudo nisi originis, ratione materiae in divinis determinatur ad habitudinem principii; et ideo in Deo idem est dicere Spiritus Filii, quod Spiritus procedit a Filio.#And it must be said, that the genitive (case), although it is denominated from a habitude of principle, nevertheless it conveys another habitude, nay other (habitudes),12 such as (that) of possession; but since among the divine there falls neither a diversity nor a habitude except of origin, since the reckoning of matter among the divine is determined according to the habitude of principle; and for that reason in God it is the same to say the Spirit of the Son, (and) that the Spirit proceeds from the Son.###10 Ex vetusioribus mss. et ed. 1 supplevimus principalia.20 Cap. 21, 21.0 Vide apud Lyranum.30 Vers. 15. seqq.40 Vers. 2. seqq.50 Vers. 6. seqq.60 Vers. 18. seqq.00 Paulo ante ed. 1 toleranda loco tolerandum.70 Vat. praeter fidem mss. et ed. 1 pro hac interiectione ponit et quaeritur.80 Libr. de Conc. praesc. Dei cum libr. arb. q. 3. c. 6:0 Quoniam ipsa (S. Scriptura), sicuti nulli adversatur veritati, ita nulli favet falsitati, hoc ipso quia non negat, quod ratione dicitur eius auctoritate suscipitur. 000 Et paulo post:0 Sic itaque sacra Scriptura omnis veritatis, quam ratio colligit, auctoritatem continet, cum illam aut aperte affirmat aut nullatenus negat.90 Vat. contra multos codd. ut A F G H I T X Z etc. et ed. 1 praeterea, sed minus bene, quia verba quae iuris erant hic significant decretum ad disciplinam spectans, non stricte ad fidem. 0Vat. et paulo infra intellexerunt loco intellexerint.0 Mox aliqui codd. ut V W X praesumptuosa pro praesumptuosorum.100 S. Doctor loquitur tantum hypothetice et praecise de prohibitionem explanationis, quatenus est res disciplinaria; minime autem supponit 0000 quod innuit nota marginalis in Vaticana ed. 000 decreta Concilii vere generalis in rebus fidei esse reformabilis.110 Unus alterve cod. ut V bb quare non 0loco quaeritur ratio.120 In Vat. desunt verba immo alias, quae tamen habentur in mss. et ed. 1.##10 From the older manuscripts and edition 1, we have supplied principle [principalia].20 Acts 21:210 See (the commentary) in (Nicolas) de Lyra0s Glossa.30 Verse 15 ff.40 Verse 2 ff.50 Verse 6 ff.60 Verse 18 ff.0 00 A little before this edition 1 has for tolerating [ad toleranda] in place of to tolerate [ad tolerandum].70 The Vatican edition, not trusting in the manuscripts and edition 1, in place of this interjection puts and there is asked [et quaeritur].80 His book, On the Foreknowledge of the Divine Councils with Free Will, q. 3, ch. 6:0 Since (Sacred Scripture), as it is the adversary of no truth, so favors no falsity, by the very (fact) that it does not deny, that what is said by reason it acknowledges by its own authority. 000 And a little after this:0 And so in this manner Scripture contains the authority of every truth, which reason gathers, since it either affirms it openly or denies it to no extent.90 The Vatican edition, contrary to many codices, such as A F G H I T X Z etc. and edition 1, has moreover [praeterea] instead of on this account [propterea], but less well, because the words what belonged to the law [quae iuris erant] here signify the decree regarding discipline, not strictly (that) regarding the Faith. 0The Vatican edition also a little below this has the indicative instead of the subjunctive for though the understood [quamvis intellexerunt]. 0Then some codices, such as V W X, have presumptuous mouths [ora praesumptuosa] for mouths of the presumptuous [ora praesumptuosorum].10 The



Seraphic Doctor speaks only hypothetically and precisely concerning the prohibition of explanation, to the extent that it is a disciplinary matter; he does not in the least manner suppose  $\emptyset$  as the marginal note in the Vatican edition suggests  $\emptyset$  that the decrees of a general Council  $\emptyset$  are reformable in matters of the Faith.<sup>11</sup>  $\emptyset$  One or the other codices, such as V and bb, have why not [quare non] in place of the reason is asked [quaeritur ratio].<sup>12</sup>  $\emptyset$  In the Vatican edition the words nay other (habitudes) are lacking, which however are had in the manuscripts and edition 1.###p. 218 $\emptyset$  Praeterea, alia est ratio, quia Spiritus, secundum quod est nomen absolutum, sicut hoc nomen Deus, non habet proprie construi cum genitivo, quia tunc idem esset dicere Spiritus Filii quod Deus Filii: $\emptyset$  ergo oportet, quod accipiatur Spiritus, secundum quod dicitur a spiratione; et sic est nomen importans originem: $\emptyset$  ergo sicut sequitur: $\emptyset$  Filius Patris, ergo Filius qui est a Patre, et ita est dicere Spiritus Filii, id est, Spiritus qui est a Filio.##Moreover, the other reason is, that  $\emptyset$  Spirit $\emptyset$ , according to which it is an absolute noun, just as this noun  $\emptyset$  God $\emptyset$  (is), does not properly have to be constructed with the genitive, because then it would be the same to say the Spirit of the Son as [quod] the God of the Son: $\emptyset$  therefore it is opportune, that  $\emptyset$  Spirit $\emptyset$  be accepted, according to which it is meant from spiration, and in this manner it is a noun conveying origin: $\emptyset$  therefore just as it follows: $\emptyset$   $\emptyset$  The Son of the Father, therefore the Son, who is from the Father, $\emptyset$  so also it is that to say  $\emptyset$  Spirit of the Son $\emptyset$ , that is,  $\emptyset$  the Spirit, who is from the Son. $\emptyset$ ##DUB. IV.##DOUBT IV##Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit: $\emptyset$  Non sine me et sine meo et Patris arbitrio etc.  $\emptyset$  Videtur male dicere, quia qui habet arbitrium super aliquem habet dominium super illum:<sup>1</sup> ergo videtur secundum hoc, quod Spiritus sanctus sit inferior Filio.  $\emptyset$  Si tu dicas, quod arbitrium dicat voluntatem; hoc nihil est, quia<sup>2</sup> similiter cum una voluntas sit trium, similiter Filius non loquitur sine arbitrio Spiritus sancti, et Pater similiter; quod non dicitur proprie.##Is likewise asked of this which he says: $\emptyset$  not without Me and without My judgment [arbitrio] and (that) of the Father etc..  $\emptyset$  It seems that he speaks badly, because he who has judgment [arbitrium] over anyone has dominion over him:<sup>1</sup> therefore it seems according to this, that the Holy Spirit is inferior to the Son. $\emptyset$  If you say, that  $\emptyset$  judgment $\emptyset$  (here) means  $\emptyset$  will $\emptyset$ ; this is nothing, because<sup>2</sup> similarly since the one Will belongs to the Three, similarly the Son does not speak without the judgment of the Holy Spirit, and the Father similarly; because it is not said properly (of any one Person).##RESPONDEO: $\emptyset$  Dicendum, quod Spiritus sanctus est Patri et Filio consubstantialis, ita quod a Patre et Filio procedit; operatio ergo Spiritus sancti communis est Patri et Filio, et similiter aequae habet esse<sup>3</sup> a Patre et Filio; ita quod non est dicere, quod habeat locutionem propriam, nec quod habeat locutionem a se; et haec duo voluit excludere Dominus cum dixit: $\emptyset$  Non loquetur a semetipso,<sup>4</sup> ut excludatur ratio proprii et ratio primi principii.  $\emptyset$  Et hoc exponens Didymus contra proprium dicit: $\emptyset$  Non sine me, contra rationem primi principii dicit: Sine meo et Patris arbitrio; et arbitrium non importat dominium vel<sup>5</sup> causalitatem, sed solum auctoritatem in Patre et Filio respectu Spiritus sancti vel eius operationis. ##RESPOND: $\emptyset$  It must be said, that the Holy Spirit is consubstantial to the Father and Son, such that He proceeds from the Father and the Son; therefore the operation of the Holy Spirit is common to the Father and the Son, and similarly He equally has  $\emptyset$  being $\emptyset$  [esse]<sup>3</sup> from the Father and the Son; such that it is not that He speaks, because He has His own speech, nor because He has speech from Himself; and these two the Lord wanted to exclude when He said: $\emptyset$  He does not speak on His own,<sup>4</sup> so that there is excluded the reckoning of what is proper [ratio proprii] and the reckoning of a first principle.  $\emptyset$  And (St.) Didymus (the Blind), explaining

this against (understanding this as what is) proper, says: Not without Me, against (understanding this as) a reckoning of a first principle: Without My judgment and (that) of the Father; and  $\emptyset$  judgment $\emptyset$  does not convey dominion and/or<sup>5</sup> causality, but only authority in the Father and the Son in respect to the Holy Spirit and/or to His operation.###<sup>1</sup> Vat. cum cod. cc illud, et paulo ante aliquid loco aliquem, sed obest auctoritas antiquiorum codd. et ed. 1.<sup>2</sup> Cod. Z cum ed. 1 addit tunc.<sup>3</sup> In cod. bb additur et loqui.<sup>4</sup> Ioan. 16, 13.<sup>5</sup> Ex antiquis mss. et ed. 1 substituimus vel loco sive.##<sup>1</sup> The Vatican edition together with codex cc has it [illud], and a little before this anything

```
ad#####0###1###E###F###Y###Z###[###v########  
#######  
#####
```

##?

##?

##?

##?

##?

##?

#####

#####?###?###?####

###

##Q

##R

##T

##0



##0

##0

##0

##0

#####Y##r##s##u##0##0##0##0#####  
%###6###0###0#####0###0###0###0#####2###3###5###0###0###0###0###00000000000j  
0000000000000000000000000000000000!#h0a0##h##0#5#0H\*#0J##QJ##\#0^J##  
#h0a0##h##0#CJ0#0J##QJ##^J##aJ0###h0a0##h##0#CJ##0J##QJ##^J#####h0a0##h##0#0J##  
QJ##^J##aJ#####h0a0##h##0#6#0J##QJ##]#0^J#####h0a0##h##0#0J##QJ##^J#####h0a0##h  
##0#5#0J##QJ##\#0^J##:###  
###0###0###0###0###V###0#####0#####0#####Z#####0####  
#####0#####  
#####M##kd0####\$##\$If#####T###00###0  
##+##C #####C  
  
#####0#0##6##0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###030#####□#40#  
#####a0###0T## \$\$\$##\$If####a\$##M##kd0####\$##\$If#####T###00###0  
##+##C #####C  
  
#####0#0##6##0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###030#####□#40#  
#####a0###0T###0###0###0#####;###<###>###0###0###0###0###0#####  
##### ,###g###w### |  
###0###0###0#####0###0###0###0#####D###E#####0###0###0#####



```
## ### ##A #I #J #K #L #####  
###!##
```

```
!##{!##@!##@!##@!##@!##@!##@!  
###"#R#"#S#"#T#"#z#"#@#"#@#"#@#"#@#"#@#"#@#"#@#"#####  
####$###$##&$##($###000H000?00000?00?000000?00000000?0?0000000000000000##  
###ha0##h##0J##QJ##^J###%ha0##h##0#5#CJ##H*#OJ##QJ##\  
#0^J####ha0##h##0J##QJ##^J#aJ#####ha0##h##0CJ##OJ##QJ##^J###"ha0##h##0#6  
#CJ##OJ##QJ##]#0^J##E($#$<$$#$=$T$##0$##0$##0%##0%##0%##0%##0%##0%##0%##0%  
%###&##
```



#####0#0##6##0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###030#####[]#40#



b###b###b###b##yb##0b##0b##0b##0b##0b###c##4c##5c##6c##~c##0c##0c##0c##0c##0c##0  
c###d##ed##sd###e##~e##0e##0e##0e###f##>f##0f###g##Kg##0g##og##0g##0g##0g###h##0  
h###i##

[illegible]

```
0n##0n##0n##0n##0n##0n##+o##-o##/o##0o##0o##0#####0#####0#####
###0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####
#0#####
#####
#####
```

```
##+##C          #####C
```

##+##C #####C

```
##+##C          #####C
```

```
##+##C      #####C
```

```
##+##C          #####C
```

#####  
 \$\$\$#\$Tf#####a\$##M##kd?

###\$##\$If#####T###00###  
##-##C #####C

#####0#0##6##0####0###0#0####0####0#0####0###0#0####0###030#####40#  
#####a0###0T## ###\$##\$If####a\$##M##kd:

###\$##\$If#####T###00###  
##+##C #####C

#####0#0##6##0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###030#####40#  
#####a0###0T####0y##0y###z##0z##3{##0{##0{##0{##0{##0#####0#####0  
#####0#####0#####V#####M#####M#####  
##### \$##\$##\$If####a\$##M##kd3###\$##\$If#####T###00###  
##+##C #####C

#####0#0##6##0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###030#####40#  
#####a0###0T#####\$##00##\$If####^00a\$##M##kd0

###\$##\$#If#####T###00###  
##+##C #####C

#####0#0##6##0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###030#####40#  
#####a0###0T####0{##0{##0{##0{##6|#7|#C|#E|#x|##0|##0|##0|  
##0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####  
0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####  
#####  
#####M##kd  
###\$##\$#If#####T###00###  
##+##C #####C

#####0#0##6##0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###030#####40#  
#####a0###0T## ###\$##\$#If####a\$###B|#C|#E|#v|#w|#x|##0|##0|##0|##0|##0|  
##0|##0|##0|##0|##0|##0|###}###}##





0##00##00##Lj##ê##ç##ı##~#####0###0##  
0###0###0###0###0###0##D0##J0##K0##L0##M0##u0##00##00##00##00##00##00##00##00##0  
0##0##0###0###0##00000000000000000000000000δ^0n00000000000000#"#h0a0##h##0#6#0CJ#  
#0J##QJ##]#0^J###%#h0a0##h##0#5#0CJ##H\*#0J##QJ##\#0^J##  
%#j0####h0a0##h##0#CJ##0J##QJ##U##^J##!#h0a0##h##0#5#0H\*#0J##QJ##\  
#0^J####h0a0##h##0#CJ##0J##QJ##^J####h0a0##h##0#0J##QJ##^J##aJ####h0a0##h##0#0  
J##QJ##^J##7f0##g0##

0##e##e##^###0##L0##00##00##0#####0#####0#####Z#####  
T#####T#####T#####T#####T#####T#####  
\$#If#####M##kdx####\$##\$If#####T###00###0  
##+##C #####C

#####0#0##6##0####0###0#0####0####0#0####0####0#0####0###030#####□#40#  
#####a0###0T## \$\$\$##\$If####a\$##M##kd%####\$##\$If#####T###00###0  
##+##C #####C

#####0#0##6##0####0###0#0####0####0#0####0####0#0####0###030#####□#40#  
#####a0###0T### #0##





```
#0##0###0###0###0###0###(0###0###0###0###0###0###20###0000e0e00000000000000000e
0e000000e^0e000####h0a0##h##0#> *CJ##0J##QJ##^J##
%#j0###h0a0##h##0#CJ##0J##QJ##U##^J#####h0a0##h##0#0J##QJ##^J##aJ##
%#h0a0##h##0#5#0CJ##H*#0J##QJ##\
#0^J###h0a0##h##0#0J##QJ##^J#####h0a0##h##0#CJ##0J##QJ##^J###"h0a0##h##0#6#0CJ
##0J##QJ##]#0^J##720##30##40##60##K0##Z0##[0##\
0##00##00##00##0##'###[]####μ##0###0###0##-0##<0##=0##?0###00###0###0###0###0##!
0##20###0###0###0###0###0###[0##_0##j0##n0###00###00###00###p##ó##ı##
8##0###0###0###[]##[]##ç0##A0##J0##K0##M0##j0##l0##n0###00###00###00###00###0###0##70#
#W0##d0##00000000ğğ00000000000000000000000000ğğğ000ğğ00000ğğ00000ğğğğ#"h0a0##h##0#6#
0CJ##0J##QJ##]#0^J#####h0a0##h##0#>*CJ##0J##QJ##^J#####h0a0##h##0#CJ##0J##QJ##^J
###%#h0a0##h##0#5#0CJ##H*#0J##QJ##\
#0^J###h0a0##h##0#0J##QJ##^J##Ed0##q0##[]0###00###00###00###00###00###00###00###00###t0##
u0##00##00###0##00##00###0###0###0###0###90##G0##y0##z0##|
0##00###0##J0##R0##x0##}0###00###00###00###00###00###00###0000[]000u0I0u0000e0u0e00e
0e0e0e00u#####h0a0##h##0#6#0J##QJ##]#0^J###!h0a0##h##0#5#0H*#0J##QJ##\
#0^J###h0a0##h##0#0J##QJ##^J###,#h0a0##h##0#5#06#0J##QJ##\#0]^0^J##mH          #sH
      ##h0a0##h##0#0J##QJ##^J##mH    #sH      ##)#j%###h0a0##h##0#0J##QJ##U##^J##mH
#sH
```

```
###h@a0##h##0#0J##QJ##^J##aJ###"h@a0##h##0#6#0CJ##0J##QJ##]#0^J#####h@a0##h##0#
CJ##0J##QJ##^J##'00##00##00##00##00##0###0###0###00#00#####0#####0
#####0#####0#####P#####0#####0#####0
#####M##kd0####$##$If#####T###00###0
##-##C          #####C
```

```
#####0#0##6##0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###030#####40#
#####a0###0T##
    ###$##$If####a#####$a$#####$a$##M##kd0####$##$If#####T###00###0
##+##C      #####C
```

[illegible]

```
#####0#0##6###0####0###0#0#####0###0#0#####0###030#####[#40#
#####a0####0##    ###$##$If####a##M##kd#####$##$If#####T###00###0
###+##C    #####C
```



[illegible]



#h@a###h##5#H\*#0J##0J##\

#SH

##+##C #####C

```
#####C
##+##C
```

```
##+##C      #####C
```

```

#####C
##+##C      #####C

```

###?      ###?      ####

#####?#####?#####?#####?#####?#####

###

###

##7

##8

##0

##0

##0



##0

##0

##0

[illegible]

##0

#####Z#####  
#####M##kd  
#####  
#####  
#####C

#####  
#####  
#####C

#####  
#####  
#####

##0

```
#####0#0##6##0###0###0#0###0###0#0###0###0###0###030#####40#
#####a0###0T####0###0###0###0###0#####?
###E###J###S###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0#####
###
```



[illegible]









-###\$##\$If####T###00###  
##+##C #####C

#####0#0##6##0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###030#####  
#####a0###0T##

###\$##\$If####a\$###K0##L0##n0##00##00##00##00##00##00##00##00##00##00#####  
#####0#####Z#####Q#####Q#####Q#####Q#####  
###Q##### ###\$##\$If####a\$##M##kd#.###\$##\$If####T###00###  
##+##C #####C

#####0#0##6##0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###030#####  
#####a0###0T## ###\$##\$If####a\$##M##kd0-###\$##\$If####T###00###  
##+##C #####C

#####0#0##6##0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###030#####  
#####a0###0T##

00##00##00##00##00##r##I##Û##d##0###0##\*0##+0##-0##/0##E0##`0##00##00##00##00##0  
0##00##00##0##0###0###0##

```
####0###0###0###0##l0###m0##n0##0##0###0##y0##z0##{0##Q##'###0##q0##r0##[]#000000  
0U0000Lj000000000E00000E000000000[]0000#####!  
#h0a0##h##0#5#0H*#0J##QJ##\#0^J####h0a0##h##0#6#0J##QJ##]#0^J###  
#h0a0##h##0CJ##OJ##QJ##^J##aJ###&#h0a0##h##0#5#0CJ##OJ##QJ##\  
#0^J##aJ#####h0a0##h##0CJ##OJ##QJ##^J#####h0a0##h##0#OJ##QJ##^J#####h0a0##h##0#  
OJ##QJ##^J##aJ#####h0a0##h##0#5#0OJ##QJ##\#0^J##/00##I##Ü###d##+0##-0##/  
0##00##00##0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0###  
#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####  
#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####  
#####0#####  
###$##$If####a$#####$If#####M##kdX.###$##$If#####T###00###0  
##+##C #####C
```

#####0#0##6##0###0###0#0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###030#####[]#40#  
#####a0###0T## ###\$##\$If####a\$###00##00##00##0#

#####m#n#####  
#####Z#####Q#####  
###\$##\$If####a\$#M#kd.###\$##\$If####T###0###  
##+##C#####C  
  
#####6#####03#####4#  
#####a#####T## ###\$##\$If####a\$#M#kd.###\$##\$If####T###0###  
##+##C#####C  
  
#####6#####03#####4#  
#####a#####T##  
  
##z##{##r##ù##3##3#####  
Z#####  
#####M#kd/###\$##\$If####T###0###  
##+##C#####C  
  
#####6#####03#####4#  
#####a#####T##M#kdQ/###\$##\$If####T###0###  
##+##C#####C  
  
#####6#####03#####4#  
#####a#####T## ###\$##\$If####a\$###[]###0###0##W##ù##3##k#####H##  
4##03##02##0###0###[]###0###0###0###0###&0##'0##(0##x0##y0###0###0###0###  
##0##!0##"0###0##\$0##  
%0##00##00##00##00##8##000jÿ000ÿ000j00000j0000000j00[]00[]0m#####"h0a0##h##06#0  
CJ##0J##QJ##]0^J###%#h0a0##h##05#0CJ##H\*#0J##QJ##\#0^J##  
%#j00###h0a0##h##0CJ##0J##QJ##U##^J####h0a0##h##06#0J##QJ##]0^J####h0a0##h##  
#0#CJ##0J##QJ##^J####h0a0##h##0J##QJ##^J##aJ####h0a0##h##0J##QJ##^J###!  
#h0a0##h##05#0H\*#0J##QJ##\  
#0^J####h0a0##h##0>#\*0J##QJ##^J###\*30##40###0##'0##(0##00##!  
0##0#####0#####0#####Z#####0#####T#####  
#####\$If####M##k  
dJ0###\$##\$If####T###0###  
##+##C#####C  
  
#####6#####03#####4#  
#####a#####T## ###\$##\$If####a\$#M#kd/###\$##\$If####T###0###  
##+##C#####C  
  
#####6#####03#####4#  
#####a#####T####!  
0##"0##\$0##00###0###0##00##:0##;0##=0##0#####0#####0##  
#####0#####0#####0#####T#####0#####  
##\$#a\$#M##kd42###\$##\$If####T###0###  
##+##C#####C  
  
#####6#####03#####4#  
#####a#####T## ###\$##\$If####a\$#####\$If####M#kd00###\$##\$If####T###0###  
##+##C#####C  
  
#####6#####03#####4#  
#####a#####T### 8##[]##[]###0###0###0###0###00##00##Σ####0###0##  
90##:0##;0##<0##=0##?  
0##E0##F0##G0##H0##I##J##K##L##M##N##O##P##Q##R##S##T##U##V##W##X##Y##Z##  
##0#5#06#00J##QJ##\#0]#0^J##mH #sH ## #h0a0##h##0J##QJ##^J##mH #sH  
##\$#h0a0##h##0J##QJ##^J##aJ##mH #sH  
##)j02###h0a0##h##0J##QJ##U##^J##mH #sH  
###h0a0##h##06#00J##QJ##]0^J####h0a0##h##0J##QJ##^J###  
%#j01###h0a0##h##0CJ##0J##QJ##U##^J####h0a0##h##0J##QJ##^J##aJ###"h0a0##h##0  
#6#0CJ##0J##QJ##]0^J####h0a0##h##0CJ##0J##QJ##^J###=0##?  
0##F0##H0##I##J##K##L##M##N##O##P##Q##R##S##T##U##V##W##X##Y##Z##



[illegible]



```
#####0#0##6###0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###030####[]#40#
#####a0###0T##   $$$##$If####a##M##kdM8###$##$If#####T###00###0
##+##C           #####C
```

```
#####I0##J0###00###00####F0##I0##J0##K0###0##f0##g0###0##h0##i0##j0###0###0##*  
0##H0##R0##00###00###00###0####0####0###g0##h0###0##{0####0####0####0##-  
0##l0##Y0##c0###00###00###00000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000  
00000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000  
00000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000  
#h0a0##h##0#5#0H*#0J##QJ##\  
#0^J####h0a0##h##0#0J##QJ##^J#####h0a0##h##0#6#0J##QJ##]0^J##Gi0##j0##h0##00##  
00##00##00##0#####0#####0#####Z#####0#####0##  
#####  
#####M##kdF9###$##$If####T###00###0  
##+##C #####C
```

```
#####0#0#6###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###030####[]#40#
#####a0###0T####00##00##00##00##00##00##00##0###0###0##
0##00##00###0###0##
```



#SH

[illegible]

###

###



###



###

##<#####  
##Z#####U#####U#####S#####S#####  
#####\$a\$##M##kd=####\$##\$If#####T###  
##+##C #####C  
  
#####6#####  
#####aT##M##kdq=####\$##\$If#####T###  
##+##C #####C  
  
#####6#####  
#####aT## ####\$##\$If####a\$##  
#####-###[###\  
###]###  
%###F###G###c###d###e#####  
#####h##h##5#0J##QJ##\  
#^J#####h##h##0J##QJ##^J##aJ###'##h##h##5#0B\*#0J##QJ##\  
#^J##phwww###h##h##0CJ##0J##QJ##^J#####h##h##6#0J##QJ##]#^J###)##h##  
##h##0B\*#CJ##0J##QJ##^J##aJ##ph#####h##h##0J##QJ##^J###  
#h##h##0J##QJ##^J##mH #sH ##\$#h##h##0CJ##0J##QJ##^J##mH #sH  
#'  
###]#####  
#####Q#####M##kd

?###\$##\$#If#####T###00###0  
##+##C #####C

#####0#0##6##0####0###0#0####0####0#0####0####0#0####0####030#####□#40#  
#####a0###0T## \$\$\$##\$#If####a\$##M##kd0>###\$##\$#If#####T###00###0  
##+##C #####C

#####0#0##6##0####0###0#0####0####0#0####0####0#0####0####030#####□#40#  
#####a0###0T## \$\$\$##\$#If####a\$#####\$##  
%###G###d###0#####0#####0#####Z#####Q#####Q##  
#####  
###\$##\$#If####a\$##M##kd0?###\$##\$#If#####T###00###0  
##+##C #####C

#####0#0##6##0####0###0#0####0####0#0####0####0#0####0####030#####□#40#  
#####a0###0T## \$\$\$##\$#If####a\$##M##kd\_?###\$##\$#If#####T###00###0  
##+##C #####C

#####0#0##6##0####0###0#0####0####0#0####0####0#0####0####030#####□#40#  
#####a0###0T###d###e###0###0###0###0###

#####Z#####T#####K###  
#####T#####T#####  
###\$##\$If####a\$#####\$If#####M##kdX@###\$##\$If#####T###00###  
##-##C #####C  
  
#####6#####  
#####a###T## ###\$##\$If####a\$##M##kd#@###\$##\$If#####T###00###  
##-##C #####C  
  
#####6#####  
#####a###T#####

[illegible]

```
#####0#0##6##0###0###0#0###0###0#0###0###0#0###0###030####□#40#
#####a0###0T####0)##0)###*###*###*##$*##9*##}*##□*##0*##0*##0*###+###+##0+##0+#
#0+##0+###,###,##
```



```
#####0#0##6##0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###030#####4#0#
#####a0###0T####&/## '/'##(/##)/##U/##`/##a/##b/##c/##0/##0/##0/##0/##0/##0/##0/
##0/##0/##0/##0/##0/##0/##0/##0/##0/##0/
###0###0##@0##L0##M0##N0##00###1##01##01##01###2##
2###2##02##@2##02##02##02##02##02##02##02##02##02###3###3##e3##r3##03##03##0
3###4###4###4###000□□□00□□□□□□00□00□□0□□□0□□□00#####h0a0##h##0#0J##QJ##^J
#####h0a0##h##0#0J##QJ##^J##aJ###"h0a0##h##0#6#0CJ##0J##QJ##]0^J###
%h0a0##h##0#5#0CJ##H*#0J##QJ##\0^J####h0a0##h##0#CJ##0J##QJ##^J###
%#j<D###h0a0##h##0#CJ##0J##QJ##U##^J###=4##(4##.4##=4##>4##?
4##A4##X4##b4##04##04##04##04##04##04##04##04##04##04##5###5##$5##
%5##&5##'5##55##65##75##D5##E5##F5##S5##T5##U5##05##05##05##05##05##05##6##
<6##N6##^6##_6##_6##l6##06###7###8##-8##.8##/8##08##08##0000e0000
^00000□0e0e0e0e00000e0000e^000e000#####h0a0##h##0#>#CJ##0J##QJ##^J##
%#j0D###h0a0##h##0#CJ##0J##QJ##U##^J####h0a0##h##0#0J##QJ##^J##aJ###
%h0a0##h##0#5#0CJ##H*#0J##QJ##\
0^J#####h0a0##h##0#0J##QJ##^J#####h0a0##h##0#CJ##0J##QJ##^J###"h0a0##h##0#6#0CJ
##0J##QJ##]0^J##7E5##T5##05##_6##.8##0:##0;##M<##0<##0<##0<##0<##0<##0>###A##0#
#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####
#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####
#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####
##      ###$##$If####a$#####$a$#####$a$##M##kd0E###$##$If####T###00###0
##+##C      #####C
```

[illegible]

A###A###A##B##1E#######Z#####Q#####  
#####Q#####  
###\$##\$If####a##M##kdF###\$##\$If####T###0###  
##-##C#####C  
  
#####6#####3#####4#  
#####a###T#####\$##\$If####a##M##kduF###\$##\$If####T###0###  
##-##C#####C  
  
#####6#####3#####4#  
#####a###T####

```
A###A###A###A###A###A###A###9A##cA##QA##QA###B##
B###B##KB##LB##QB##QB##QB###C###C##/
C##9C##RC##QC##QC###D###D##D##cD##dD###E##0E##1E##2E##3E##<E##QE##QE##QE##QE###
F##QF##QF##QF##QF##QF##QF##QF##000}[]}0000}00[]0000}0000}00000[]000}000}000#!
#h@a0##h##Q#5#QH*#0J##QJ##\
#Q^J####h@a0##h##Q#6#0J##QJ##]#Q^J#####h@a0##h##Q#0J##QJ##^J#####h@a0##h##Q#CJ#
#0J##QJ##^J#####h@a0##h##Q#0J##QJ##^J##aJ###&#h@a0##h##Q#5#0CJ##0J##QJ##\
#Q^J##aJ###"#h@a0##h##Q#5#0CJ##0J##QJ##\#Q^J###
#h@a0##h##Q#CJ##0J##QJ##^J##aJ##11E##2E###H##QK##QK##QK##UL##uL##QL##QL##Q#####
#####Q#####Q#####Z#####T#####T#####T#####
####T#####T#####T#####$I f#####M##kdnG###$##$I f#####T###
Q0###Q
##+##C #####C

#####Q#Q##6##Q####Q###Q#Q####Q###Q#Q####Q###Q#Q####Q###Q3Q#####[]#4Q#
#####aQ###QT## $$$I f#####a$##M##kd#G###$##$I f#####T###Q0###Q
##+##C #####C

#####Q#Q##6##Q####Q###Q#Q####Q###Q#Q####Q###Q#Q####Q###Q3Q#####[]#4Q#
#####aQ###QT### QF##QF###G###G###G##!
G##,G##>G##MG##UG##pG##QG##QG###H###H###H###H###
```

```
H##0H##0H##0H###I####1##  
I###I##0I##0I##0I##0I###J###J##  
%J##GJ##[J##0J##0J###K###K###K###K##AK##qK##rK##0K##0K##0K##000000000000ò000000  
000000000000000000000000À#####h@a0##h##0CJ##0J##QJ##^J#  
####h@a0##h##0#5#00J##QJ##\#0^J###"#h@a0##h##0#5#0CJ##0J##QJ##\#0^J###  
#h@a0##h##0CJ##0J##QJ##^J##aJ#####h@a0##h##0J##QJ##^J##aJ###!  
#h@a0##h##0#5#0H*#0J##QJ##\  
#0^J####h@a0##h##0J##QJ##^J#####h@a0##h##0#6#00J##QJ##]#0^J##-  
0K##0K##0K##0K##0K##0K###L###L###L###L#"L##TL##UL##VL##oL##sL##tL##uL##vL##0L##  
0L##0L##0L##0L##0L##0L##0L##0L##0L##0L##0L##0L##0L##0L##0L##M###M###M###8M##  
@M##VM##\M##0M##0M##0M##0M##0M##0M##0M##0M##N###0###0##000  
□□0□□□□0000□□□0□□□0□□□0□□0##U##  
%#jch###h@a0##h##0CJ##0J##QJ##U##^J####h@a0##h##0J##QJ##^J#####h@a0##h##0J#  
#QJ##^J##aJ###"#h@a0##h##0#6#0CJ##0J##QJ##]#0^J###  
%#h@a0##h##0#5#0CJ##H*#0J##QJ##\#0^J####h@a0##h##0CJ##0J##QJ##^J###  
%#j0G###h@a0##h##0CJ##0J##QJ##U##^J###50L##0L##0L##0M##0M###0##*0##00##00##  
+0##,0##-  
0##0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####  
#0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####0#####  
#####  
#####  
#####$a$$M##kd$I###$$$If#####T###  
00###0  
##+-##C #####C  
  
#####0#0##6##0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###0#0####0###030#####□#40#  
#####a0###0T#####$If#####
```

#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####ded and speaking [et loqui].40 Jn 16:13.50 From  
the ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have substituted and/or [vel] in place  
of or [sive].###The English translation here has been released to the public  
domain by its author. The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which  
follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quaracchi Edition. The translation  
of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that  
of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation than that which is  
necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [ ] brackets contain Latin  
terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the  
English translator. Items in round ( ) brackets are terms implicit in the Latin  
syntax or which are required for clarity in English.  
#####  
#####  
#####0####0###0###0##)0##\*0##+  
0##m0##s0##00##00##00##00##00##00##00####0###0###0##\*0##+0##,0##-0##00e0e000~  
□0www000#####  
#####\$#h0a0##h##0#CJ##OJ##QJ##^J##mH  
    #sH   ## #h0a0##h##0#OJ##QJ##^J##mH #sH  
    ##)#jXI###h0a0##h##0#OJ##QJ##U##^J##mH     #sH  
    ###h0a0##h##0#OJ##QJ##^J##aJ###%#h0a0##h##0#5#0CJ##H\*#OJ##QJ##\  
#0^J####h0a0##h##0#OJ##QJ##^J####h0a0##h##0#CJ##OJ##QJ##^J###"#h0a0##h##0#6#0CJ  
##OJ##QJ##l#0^J###3#       0#&P #10h##00. 00A!07#"07##0S#\$0S%0###00##00#

#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####Q###\$#I f#####  
!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C 30#####40###  
###0T##Q##\$##\$#I f#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C  
30#####40###  
###0T##Q##\$##\$#I f#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C  
30#####40###  
###0T##Q##\$##\$#I f#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C  
30#####40###  
###0T##Q##\$##\$#I f#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C  
30#####40###  
###0T##Q##\$##\$#I f#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C  
30#####40###  
###0T##Q##\$##\$#I f#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C  
30#####40###  
###0T##Q##\$##\$#I f#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C  
30#####40###  
###0T##0###D#d#####0#0#0  
#####0V#####  
0#####  
##3##0####0#000#0#####0####C#"0####0#J###0#####0#0  
##0##8#8###0#####00###D#d#####0#0#0  
#####0V#####  
0#####  
##3##0####0#000#0#####0####C#"0####0#J###0#####0#0  
##0##8#8###0#####0Q##\$##\$#I f#####0#0!v##h##v#####v##  
#:V###0#0##6##0###50####C 30#####40###  
###0T##0###D#d#####0#0##\*<#####0V  
#####  
0#####  
##3##0####0#000#0#####0####C#"0####0#####0##\*##0##(##0#####0Q##\$##\$#  
I f#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C 30#####40###  
###0T##Q##\$##\$#I f#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C  
30#####40###  
###0T##Q##\$##\$#I f#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C  
30#####40###  
###0T##Q##\$##\$#I f#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C  
30#####40###  
###0T##Q##\$##\$#I f#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C  
30#####40###  
###0T##0###D#d#####0#0#0  
#####0V#####  
0#####  
##3##0####0#000#0#####0####C#"0####0#J###0#####0#0  
##0##8#8###0#####00###D#d#####0#0#0  
#####0V#####  
0#####  
##3##0####0#000#0#####0####C#"0####0#J###0#####0#0  
##0##8#8###0#####0Q##\$##\$#I f#####0#0!v##h##v#####v##  
#:V###0#0##6##0###50####C 30#####40###  
###0T##0###D#d#####0#0##\*<#####0V  
#####  
0#####  
##3##0####0#000#0#####0####C#"0####0#####0##\*##0##(##0#####0Q##\$##\$#  
I f#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C 30#####40###  
###0T##Q##\$##\$#I f#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C  
30#####40###  
###0T##Q##\$##\$#I f#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C

[illegible]



###0T##Q##\$#\$#If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C  
30#####[]#40###  
###0T##Q##\$#\$#If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C  
30#####[]#40###  
###0T##Q##\$#\$#If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C  
30#####[]#40###  
###0T##Q##\$#\$#If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C  
30#####[]#40###  
###0T##Q##\$#\$#If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C  
30#####[]#40###  
###0T##Q##\$#\$#If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C  
30#####[]#40###  
###0T##Q##\$#\$#If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C  
30#####[]#40###  
###0T##Q##\$#\$#If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C  
30#####[]#40###  
###0T##Q##\$#\$#If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C  
30#####[]#40###  
###0T##Q##\$#\$#If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C  
30#####[]#40###  
###0T##0###D#d#####0#0#0  
#####0V#####  
0####  
####  
##3##0####0#000#0#####0#####C#"0####0#J###0#####0#0##0##8#8###0####  
##00###D#d#####0#0#0  
#####0V#####  
0#####  
##3##0####0#000#0#####0#####C#"0####0#J###0#####0#0##0##8#8###0####  
##0Q##\$#\$#If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C  
30#####[]#40###  
###0T##0###D#d#####0#0##\*<#####0V  
#####  
0####

####  
##3##0#####0#000#0#####0#####C#"0#####0#####0###\*##0##( (#(###0#####0Q##\$##\$#  
If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C 30#####□#40###  
###0T##Q##\$##\$#If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C  
30#####□#40###  
###0T##Q##\$##\$#If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C  
30#####□#40###  
###0T##Q##\$##\$#If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C  
30#####□#40###  
###0T##Q##\$##\$#If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C  
30#####□#40###  
###0T##Q##\$##\$#If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C  
30#####□#40###  
###0T##Q##\$##\$#If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C  
30#####□#40###  
###0T##Q##\$##\$#If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C  
30#####□#40###  
###0T##Q##\$##\$#If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C  
30#####□#40###  
###0T##Q##\$##\$#If#####0#0!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C  
30#####□#40###  
###0T##0###D#d#####0#0#0  
#####0V#####  
0#####  
##3##0#####0#000#0#####0#####C#"0#####0J###0#####0#0##0##8#8###0####

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

If#####!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C 30#####40###  
###0T##Q##\$##\$If#####!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C  
30#####40###  
###0T##Q##\$##\$If#####!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C  
30#####40###  
###0T##Q##\$##\$If#####!v##h##v#####v## #:V###0#0##6##0###50####C  
30#####40###  
###0T##0###D#d#####  
#####V#####  
0####\$####  
##3##0####0#000#0#####0#####C#"0####0#J###0#####0#0  
##0##8#8###0#####00###D#d#####0#0#0  
#####V#####  
0####%####  
##3##0####0#000#0#####0#####C#"0####0#J###0#####0#0  
##0##8#8###0#####\$##0Q##\$##\$If#####!v##h##v#####v##  
#:V###0#0##6##0###50####C 30#####40###  
###0T##0###D#d#####0#0##\*<#####V  
#####  
0####&####  
##3##0####0#000#0#####0#####C#"0####0#####0###\*##0##(##(###0####  
%##0#####x#####0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###6###6#  
##6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###v###v###v###v###v###v###v###v###v###6###6###6###6#  
##6###6###>###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6#  
##6#  
##6###6###0###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6###6#  
##6#  
##6#  
##6#  
##6#  
##6###6###p###6###2#####0###0###0###0#####&###6###F###V###f###v###0###0#  
##0###0###0###0#####2###(###0###0###&###6###F###V###f###v###0###0###0###0###0#  
##0###0#####&###6###F###V###f###v###0###0###0###0###0###0###0#####&###6#  
##F###V###f###v###0###0###0###0###0###0#####&###6###F###V###f###v###0###0#  
##0###0###0###0#####&###6###F###V###f###v###0###0###0###0###0###0#####  
##&###6###F###V###f###v###0###0###8###X###0#####V###~###0###0###0###0###0#  
##0###0###0##### ##0###@###0###0##### ##0###@###0###0#####  
###0###@###0###0##### ##0###@###0###0#####  
###0###@###0###0##### ##0###@###0###0#####  
###0###@###0###0##### ##0###@###0###0#####  
###0###@###0###0##### ##0###@###0###0#####  
###0###@###0###0##### ##0###@###6###6###6###6###6###6#####\_H##mH  
#nH  
#sH  
#tH  
#####<##`0##<#

#####N#o#r#m#a#l#####CJ##\_H##mH  
,sH  
,tH



X##@####X#

#####T#t#u#l#o# #1#####d#d#@&#[\$#\####5#CJ0#KH\$#\#aJ0#mH

SH

T##@##"T#

#####T#t#u#l#o# #2#####d#d#@&#[\$#\#####5#CJ\$#\#aJ\$#mH

SH

#####N#A 00#N#

#####Fu#e#n#t#e# #d#e# #p#r#r#a#f#o# #p#r#e#d#e#t#e#r#.#####V#i@#V#



#####0#

#T#a#b#l#a# #n#o#r#m#a#l### #:V###4#####4###  
#l#a#####,#k ##,#####0# #S#i#n# #l#i#s#t#a#####

#####N#^@##0#N#

#####

#N#o#r#m#a#l# #(#W#e#b#)#####@d#@d#[\$#\##

#aJ##mH

SH

PK#####!#00#00#####[Content\_Types].xml000N00#E0H00-J00@#%0ăĒ|0ș\$#0  
ج0U00L0TB0 #l,030;0r0##0000J00B+\$0#G]0070  
\*V00##<a0#00(700I00R0{0pgL0=00r#00008#05v&00#0uQ0# 800C00#00#X=000\$ 0?  
6N0JC#000000F0#B.' '0.0+000Y0T0#00^e50500 0#0#đ



0\_0g #-0;00000Yl06|00^0N0#`0?0#00[]###00##PK#####!  
#00###6#####\_rels/.rels000j00

000}000#%v/00C/0}#0(0h"#0#0000#  
0#0000=000000 #00#00C?0h0v=000^00  
%#[xp00{0\_0Pb<01#0H000##0000R0Bd00#0JE04b\$00q\_0#00#06L00#R07`00000000000,0E#n70  
Lib00/0S000e00#e0000###00##PK#####!#ky0#0###0#####theme/theme/  
themeManager.xml

0M

0 #@0}0w007c0(Eb0"00#C0#AÃk0000700#'KY,0#  
0e0.000|,0#00H#0,l00#00x#N0#0I0sQ}#r0000 +0!0,0^0\$j=0GW000)0E0+&  
#80###00##PK#####!#t]#0###0#####theme/theme/theme1.xml0YKo#7#0#0X  
d0##0#0#70#00"GJK000.#000[00z)P -zh00z(0#h0#000#pU?0C0j0000##  
[0000f0qf83s0iL0#0#aI0/0\*0#N0, I00#000=!Q# 0#00gX0w0?00#j#00#00B?0r000&0000-60  
<#1## 0<\#8:#01][0jk1"00%(#0}00#0#0Fd0000#09#)000R03###00  
!f0E0w0hÇ0#v00000Q\$<h0%00m0YC[0#0+d0000020`00000 00R0Vj;0~0r#  
vwj0Z00#0p#+M00:00J05@0Cw000([xC00#0YxJ0W000n#0h05(0W0000f0m0j#\_[00K;0J0yA#%0x  
]006Z000#00N0f0t0g0##DC#]j0#K0X0010]#( E0\$00M0#!0[00#'0# ##0 J0000z0[  
پ00W0Wفh##CZ0#&biH00D00l00A0o@09{00000g40=050[000vQ#0r0~0\_z0000#÷S/  
j00Wo000}0aN)o{0000000##0;#Lx00Xx#00{0bX00?#0I0#DL00\$\$(Aj#0000,00

Q0050m00#R0#xozl#0E|\*0C0(0000&0N+<Ps#f0000=90000#000n000rg:0#K\  
\*[#0h#Q0H#0#K0=cc0#0{B0e0}20L000#0000\$}2000#0%10e0"#00l000k20Zu#00H0#0:00100x#M  
%0]\*0(0000\\${3>4q#!00!000#X#00!  
00#N[]#i000}:0m\$0d0w0#30m6nE(000=0D&0s10#E0#0.0>0w00#?  
0d00##l000l0#20I0##0d0#0000#00##!  
0J5;<0R0#'00hNC+00000###{0>w0h00e000#00.v#0}dQ0000nn000##V00p0V◆-  
\$0#Jb0Wi>#0060@00]#pH0c#x@0#0xq#0P0##0Wj=00U0hup00[000#0}ylyl'##|  
e#H00{m0GQ0#0>0.0nA0r[]!000#0:0F0-0#[]000\$00#Z0}00]0##00#/  
#0000;n0V00b00\*00.070p0]M00|0MM#M0#

ud9c0047=0000iV00NfU0q0000a0t20010d00#0#u0#00c0x0ψP3\_00>0#0>#taP003000#N"0Te#&0p  
!GZ00L~AdHu0#N0'R#0Lu(0

#ph0000#0N0}#0000:0L+0@0#/U0q800)0V/#0r0m0#Z0#00UH#00\$6#\$00Ae\$}0#Fs00+0 ,6#,n+0s  
W-0#j0W000\_00##0y#400S00w03?00W#H#h00#PxzSq]0<0040.0i00#n6  
m#00#^000T000qU\_o#.00)S00 0  
#000cq]\_00bn000)h0600F#Bf0&0#00p#0 v0z0B40o/C0000020B000R00  
f00H0=J10000&:0hn0uH##-0MH+##9p00d<#040n0(K00000\0|0û#V0l  
00E070S0#A0U0ee0#0vPN0##0#0'0"0#  
S0vQ:00qD'#0\*000S0N09#}00000

#5L0#0A0  
0iT000U#0^,0,g\$fZYEUW#0f000#[^00#00&00fV04u/000y0[0#0\*##00  
0(##0b200b000U00F001\_0#0.S\$00\_00]0[^#0000\*?0-F-

00}0000nn~0f0cH#m0r0T  
0J0l0#4D=0iC0n0###00##PK#####!#  
è00#####'###theme/theme/\_rels/themeManager.xml.rels00M  
00#00w#ooF#0&00#0056?\$Q00  
0, #.0a00i0000#c201h0##:0q00m00@R#N00;d0`00o70#g0K(M&\$R(.10r#'J00HT0800V0"00A00H0  
u}00#|0\$0b#{0##0P00008#0g/##]0QAs,(0000#00L#0[0000###00##PK##-#####!  
#00#00#####[Content\_Types].xmlPK##-#####!  
#00###6#####0###\_rels/.relsPK##-#####!  
#ky0#0###0#####theme/theme/themeManager.xmlPK##-#####!  
#t]#0###0#####0###theme/theme/theme1.xmlPK##-#####!#  
è00#####'  
##theme/theme/\_rels/themeManager.xml.relsPK#####]###0  
####<?xml version="1.0" encoding="UTF-8" standalone="yes"?>  
<a:clrMap xmlns:a="http://schemas.openxmlformats.org/drawingml/2006/main"  
bg1="lt1" tx1="dk1" bg2="lt2" tx2="dk2" accent1="accent1" accent2="accent2"  
accent3="accent3" accent4="accent4" accent5="accent5" accent6="accent6"  
hlink="hlink" folHlink="folHlink"/>####:E#####00000#####  
##0###T###(\$##@)##0/##[4###>###K##0Q##0V##0^## b##0i##0m##0o##)v##B|  
##K###0##t0##00##ص##"0##0##v0##20##d0###0##00##C0##00###0##00##T0###0##~0##00##  
0###0###4###0###0###0###0\*###/##]7###F##T##zW##0`###c###}##A0##00##  
0##8##00##0##0##j0##  
0##00##30##z0##00##00##@0##u0#####0#####0###0###v###0)##&/###4###08##0<##

A##F##K###-##'###+###-###/###0###1###3###5###7###8###:###;###<###=###?  
###B###F###H###L###0###Q###S###V###Y###Z###^###`###a###b###d###f###i###k###m###o  
###p###q###r###u###v###y###|  
###~###[]########  
########  
########  
########  
###V###N)##23##k<##mQ##5c##l##m##m##n##o##\p##x##y###{##|  
###f##>##6##(#####\*#####R##`##  
#####



```

#####$###4####/#\7###@##yJ###U##b##jj###w##|
##@##K##K##3##!
##=##"##g##g##i##P##P####K
#####d#####i#####!##)##%/##E5###A##1E##L##-
##(###)###*###,###.###2###4###6###9###>###@###A###C###D###E###G###I###J###K###M
###N###P###R###T###U###W###X###[###\
###]### ###c###e###g###h###j###l###n###s###t###w###x###z###{###}#####
#####
#####
#####
#####8#####@#####
#####0#####(#####
#####B#####
#####S#####?
#####
%###0###>###E###F###P###Q###S###[###g###h###o###p###u###v###y###z###~###□###
####=-###I###U###Z###b###e###z#####
#####

```

```
##### '### (###/
###8###@###C###H###S###W###X###]###^###d###m###v###w###0###0###0###0###0###0###0
###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0
###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0#####$###
%###,###-
###1###4###9###F###0###R###W###b###f###m###v###w###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0
###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0
###   ###
#####&###*###/###6###7###?
###@###E###X###]###^###e###r###w###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0
###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0
#####"#####'###-
###7###8###=###@###G###I###P###T###Y###_###c###d###k###y###}###0###0###0###0###0
###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0#####
```

```
#####"###(##-
###.##6###9###<###@###E###F###N###0###]###^###h###j###n###o###w###0###0###0###0
###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0
###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0#####
#####!###%###&###.###/###3###6###>###?
###C###G###0###P###T###Z###^###b###d###e###h###i###m###z###|
###}###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0
###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0
###0###0##### ###
#####5###8###<###?
###@###D###E###H###I###M###N###Q###R###X###Y###[###\
###b###d###h###i###l###m###q###r###u###v###|
###}###[]###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0
###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0###0
###0#### ### ### ### ##
### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ###% ##' ##, ##-
##2 ##3 ##5 ##> ##@ ##A ##D ##E ##K ##L ##N ##0 ##R
##T ##W ##X ##^ ##_ ##d ##e ##i ##j ##m ##n ##r ##t
##z ##~ ##0 ##0 ##0 ##0 ##0 ##0 ##0 ##0 ##0 ##0 ##0 ##0
##0 ##0 ##0 ##0 ##0 ##0 ##0 ##0 ##0 ##0 ##0 ##0 ##0
##0 ##0 ##0 ##0 ##0 ##0 ##0 ##0 ##0 ##0 ##0 ##0 ##0
###
```

[illegible]

##  
##  
##  
##  
##  
##  
##  
##  
##

#####

##### "##### ,###6###;###N###R###X###^###z###  
#####

###

###

##%



##'

##+

[illegible]

### ##\$#####0###  
###P###



#####h#####p#####|  
#####@#####@#####@#####@#####@#####@#####@###

#####(#####  
#####Magistri Petri LombardiArch#

```
#^#####T0tulo######  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####  
#####K00##0#0z#00[]0####0&+000#F00"+D00:### 0###L#o#c#a#l#  
#C#r#e#d#e#n#t#i#a#l# #D#a#t#a##  
#####f##### #[0#0o[]807#00[-0_00#0#{0F0#####0##### ###/%00000c]00k00J  
00<ST00<l1080###0w0000?0q0L0rNb##q0`0m  
00J000#0Q0#r0020^0#l#t0N0(00Eb0#000E00V0?4*0b00#nj#^000.#:0/o##00\{00x00  
00#0:L:NzK0ij000T00Xst0X#0000Ce0#.NO}p  
00#0[]0<0r0#"0#p  
0##1#0N0\2] 00H0Lt00A0 #0g:000f#S010r0S00rm0#0M0.000#0j$0$_#0RNM00lk#00ib0/0\  
00#v0#L0#0$?0P#alu  
  
#^#00h0Gyt0W0mq0U&0Nq#}0@000q##0#s0K{00000R#00V}g#00s0#00/00X0#tk0080o#0xj#0~J0  
[(000^5/%w#
```



?g%k0Re00KZ00+>\*x###

000#00{0HZ00005iS0000##x2#0e0!  
S900{#0#00R0nm0Y0#&02:\*#5t00r0~0+JN00#F0T#00X3)0#0K4,#0\*00#0#0g8^#0o70/  
W0\Qn#g000N000D0'0/EC000002i0HM#0P0#  
`# 00)\$8004 0:00000#0'Th7#20.Q00#z#000{S30D#000#00W0Hql0x300#o#0]V0000h0#  
%#0P`0Q000[0f0y]0n06

0000s0i0U0##f000N000Kâ00y00#300s#0y>0;[#0)00@000g~\$0'W#0f0z000000#D0h0  
100c02#0C#κG0\$ 0(030#300040a□30#00<#D0<0#0`00!pP0E##0efa

008#0X0005I#00d, 0&0M0#0)00P00r00:#0000;Z0Sw0b0#0000(#0000Q~00##M#Nq00s#009X#00u  
##0\00#00070[0#5&b0 ##00Z0M0\x#20#0006

20#00P0000006#000000#000#0000  
l\*t\*f#00/#v0>0#e0FQK0b070

0#C0080af0g0#i7  
RZ0"00%000)000j00A,H0g#0##0  
K0#0e009<00# h0R0Y#00d00U000#0-0-`0000^0j#00#U)#000\$0|Z00)j;09+00  
#0##000wV)00#|#6000K000C00!0#n0#/LrqE1T0T0000#0"p000v00F00#00#MÜPdS|  
#0#{d#0I;0C00]Z0000#z03,∇00bQ0}00;

0000#0M##NC0(00050V#0E00 l x j 0 0 0 B##0040<0j00r0100\_  
##0#00V#0o0ak0000)000M000r0#b x 0 [0J

#X^@j00800'Û00C63p0Z0Z(#00q0&0KFB\*%000&Dk00c00200  
0(Q000"=0~#{#0#02EZ0,000000/g00={L00R#Xl#00w\#005000a00#00  
10ŋ00Z0:0`#v0f00.i00000M0g#000000n,000J0#0#0#Dev000s0|#00![P?##5000&00  
#0#00q#00."0000 80\$#0Q00000s0g0|0>A"000r00#0#0|#0000IGNV[0:0600H00b\*0 000{yl>  
v#; 00/v00-:~006s0<#0#0 J0<0



000'SC00G)#Y1#00u?mg0;0p0#B0000M000@m0}0#000#N#20~0Jy00000C040  
x0T#GuA\*0#0000##000#000#000400F0#'0tC00-"0+#,hb`nC8c07g02W  
ص#0P,j000,0#V0`cc0`#dq00#0LFed0#00P000;cz0 00C0P5K0ss00#0U(^0ri0;1

y0~#-080kL0#000R:8)6y0îsSm0#;T2G0#/0M0A00d0x0#i07#6#N#d0##0q0#00W#ɔ#  
%00000a#lhe(#k000##91J0h0#0G,b00#0  
000000#0`#vu,0ub##340v0#S0~^00LE0\_"pm#0  
#00L!000Fi00k00#000#+Rk0#r0Gc##c0?0#h0H0#  
0{#\*0000#0#,00#0o000`80000030#00H00A00]#[[0b00##AF%0H00eg002d000%td0000  
%##0\00!!00b00000HA#000#0#N00|#k0#QW000Q/5t7î#!0i/#0`##T0s000w##C!  
%0W0N00L#}#a0d'f)0#00b00c0Z0@#000T/



d00x[F#000#00

050y00#%ÉU]W@00i  
20j#[00M3}0m}□T#0cpj#s0[#0,@00#70#3#n#50'60Y007

#u0{#00;.qT#0Z(40'0r>o0##0800###0#B0{0XSI0}

90C0`V000Al>0u000%0#0\*M0#H#;0fj09V000#0#0g000#0###e700B0Y0p0+#f0"0000U-  
00'0C#Zy0K&0]000(00#Z00Z0s000#00;0#00it|.xт0d0K#0r0:0f0#ZU0i#0#U0W0?0y0#q00]  
{μ0┘000ŸQ0HkL%#0I06Ae#@#00#0000+##r,v000Gb%00600aC.0V0Vη#000^Lp  
h#0#0J00p00##0+#ZD0P0#50\_0>  
00!0#00000'#<##2y

6√□00#□0p 0<[000b#00#"0rm\*0#ò00"0s>XN|0C#000W;0\_00f0T-#000#0!  
0M#000=0IZ0008K□0{0l0E0>0lN00H0vQq00"y#V0Y00R0)V5t0\_f#-00#0-0□ cS0##0  
0#SI0fV0W?00%0VLm]0y0b.0#□0;0 r0+#00K?0zH#f □□000#;^#  
□Z]xk4#10Z~a-"2`cy0Jf0'0;#\_EL00#0)0000"C)dM0gJĚ>00wJ00G\#0?  
0'0L0k}^Fz0"0W`T0]0=^0000b0G0"0I000#J###L0□0A000##0#K00r0#0V#:0XlJ\_RAl'g#G^  
0l0(AH##|0#00@]0v.000i00@0q00^ñ0#0b@ep□#>ZL000v##00##N00\*w02□0i00c0{sAf0#x000[#]  
(00R0000'TK0?%0p0#00\_50000dB=0q0000-¼0#p]0V000)0#06/#000##0!000A00]0o000(J(#Tqk|  
n0000[0090#000#0d000#0#0#n:#00###^00#l00#(0z#q007\$0#0#0000□000v#0i0#0yN#{00##  
#30000Y000#00#o0F#Q00#0k1L^000#Z|000pbtZ0600#0v02002 X#'00{0w0□0f000j. #-0-  
y#Aw#Y□h00075#0LD0#00Tm0!m0##/#00800w-0  
00>0`0900j□#0/h1000##10\$0Ll0R0^000q/Yy0#+00P#DcG%0YY002



0000N00#y x0p#\_00b00{#060#0k000000e#\00#700000AH30k6#0(#0jg000<;0#00A0L<#  
D000

st0#Ū0j0p0e00(0K0#000>N0s#\$00#v0Dg0s0~R8r#00/0#0R

0#00\400V]00j00#0L\*#0@L0B0G?;0H00N0#000000#x@#00060#XZl)60"#[#l#0Z0

he^xM000#0c0c?#m09

[illegible]